

THE
CHRISTIAN REFORMER;
OR,
UNITARIAN
MAGAZINE AND REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, VOL. XI.

FROM JANUARY TO DECEMBER, 1855.

LONDON:
EDWARD T. WHITFIELD, 178, STRAND.

1855.

CHRISTIAN REFORMATION

CHAPTER

EDUCATION AND REFORM

THE REFORMER'S VIEW

150

THE REFORMER'S VIEW

THE REFORMER'S VIEW

THE REFORMER'S VIEW

THE REFORMER'S VIEW

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXXI.]

JANUARY, 1855.

[VOL. XI.

DR. BUNSEN AND HIS CRITICS.*

It is exactly two years since we gave an account to the readers of the *Christian Reformer* (Vol. IX. p. 1) of the first edition of the remarkable work of which we now announce a second. If there were any who supposed that no interest existed among us in questions of theological criticism and ecclesiastical history, they must have been surprised at the sale, in six months, of a work respecting a personage hardly known to general readers, and which appeared under the disadvantage of a confused arrangement and not very clear style. From our own humble pages to the aristocratic Quarterly, no literary journal has failed to devote a considerable space to an examination of it. Some of this interest, no doubt, has been excited by the station of the writer. Had Hippolytus, when recalled to life, made his appearance in a less distinguished quarter than the Prussian Embassy, he might have returned to Hades without attracting so much notice. But, besides this, there was a great deal in the book calculated to set the pens of various parties in motion to discuss the questions it suggested. Was it really the work of Hippolytus; what did it disclose to us respecting the state of the Christian Church in the second and third centuries, of which we knew so little? Did it confirm the opinion that the early Christians were Unitarians, or vindicate the orthodoxy of the ante-Nicene Fathers? Was Hippolytus Evangelical or Tractarian in his notions of Regeneration, Apostolical Succession and Sacerdotal functions,—Protestant or Papist in regard to Tradition, the number of the Sacraments, the authority of the Bishop of Rome? These are questions the answers to which bear on topics most earnestly canvassed at the present day in the world at large. There were others more exclusively interesting to scholars. Did he receive the esta-

* Hippolytus and his Age, or the Beginnings and Prospects of Christianity. By C. C. J. Bunsen, D.D., D.C.L., D.Ph. Second Edition, in two Vols. London. 1854.

St. Hippolytus and the Church of Rome, in the Earlier Part of the Third Century. By Christopher Wordsworth, D.D., Canon of Westminster, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

The Theological Critic. By the Rev. T. K. Arnold. Vol. II. [Article by the Rev. Robert Scott.]

The Ecclesiastic, Nos. LXVI. and following.

blished canon of the New Testament; did the text he used correspond with ours; was the Gospel of John the recent production of an impostor, or already time-honoured as the work of the apostle whose name it bears; did Hippolytus receive the Apocalypse as proceeding from the same author; did the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Second Epistle of Peter find a place in his list of apostolical writings? Like a stranger arriving from an unknown land, Hippolytus was questioned on all sides. Perhaps none of the questioners received exactly the answer which they expected and desired.

The publication of this second edition is the farewell of the excellent author to the country in which he has so long lived, as to have entered more deeply and thoroughly into the English mind than any foreigner had ever done. While we regret the political events which have led to his resignation of his high office, we must acknowledge that it was inevitable. Had Prussia pursued an honest and public-spirited policy, she could not have had a fitter representative than Bunsen. When her diplomacy became tortuous and selfish, it was no longer fit that it should be carried out by a zealous patriot and an honest man. We look, however, to the leisure which the cessation of public duty will afford him, as the means of his completing several valuable works in history and philology, either already begun or meditated by him.

The present edition has been expanded into seven 8vo volumes, which are sold in separate portions. The two first (to which we confine our present notice) contain, with considerable enlargement, the same matter as the corresponding volumes of the first; but the Aphorisms on the Philosophy of the History of Man are separated, forming the three volumes of the second division, and more than 300 pages precede in this new edition the Letters to Archdeacon Hare, with which the first began. In these introductory pages, the author has not only re-cast his account of the Christian Church in the age succeeding that of the apostles, but has replied to some of the objections made to his former statements, especially by Dr. Wordsworth, in the work whose title we have quoted. We shall follow his example in the notice we propose to take of the controversy which his publication has excited. Dr. Wordsworth, writing *after* the periodical critics generally, avails himself, with acknowledgment, of anything in their works suitable to his purpose.

It must be admitted that he has occasionally hit a blot in his opponent's tables. Dr. Wordsworth is a first-rate classical scholar, and, as his Athens and Attica and his pamphlet on the Pompeian Inscriptions shew, one of the greatest masters of the art of conjectural emendation that Cambridge has produced since Porson and Dobree. It is not wonderful, therefore, that, in restoring by conjecture a text so very corrupt as that of the

recovered work of Hippolytus, he should appear to greater advantage than the late Prussian ambassador. Occasionally, too, he has detected errors in Bunsen's translation, a remarkable example of which is found in Vol. I. p. 184, where Bunsen has rendered *μηδὲ τὸ παλινδρομεῖν διστάσῃτε*, "doubt not that you will exist again;" on which Dr. Wordsworth remarks: "Mira sane interpretatio; quod quidem viri clarissimi *παρόραμα* inter alia quibus fere innumeris Bunsenii paginæ scatent, minime commemorassem, nisi eum fundamenta fidei labefactantem et doctissimorum virorum, nominatim venerandorum Antistitum Cestriensis et Menevensis bonam famam dedita opera lædentem non sine magno dolore vidissem." (P. 301.) We do not see why the correction of a wrong rendering should have been suppressed, even if Bunsen had not attacked Bishops Pearson and Bull; but there can be no doubt that it is wrong, and that, as Dr. Wordsworth observes, Hippolytus, being bishop of a seaport town, uses a nautical phrase. *Παλινδρομεῖν* is "to put back," and the meaning of his exhortation to the heathens whom he is addressing is, "do not hesitate about retracing your steps." The general tone of Dr. Wordsworth's criticisms, however, is captious and sore. He is a most zealous Protestant; but no Papist was ever more thoroughly imbued with the notion of the infallibility of his Church, and of himself as a member of it. There is nothing good or sound right or left of high Anglican theology. French Protestantism is scarcely less an abomination in his eyes than Romanism. Such is the spirit of his Letters to M. Gondon and his Diary in France. We shall now proceed to notice the principal new points of interest connected with Hippolytus, in the same order as in our former article.

The question of authorship may be regarded as at rest. The great majority of voices assigns the newly-found work to Hippolytus, not to Origen, or Caius the Presbyter. In this, Bunsen and Wordsworth are agreed. Our readers may remember that Bunsen got over in a somewhat violent way the difficulty arising from the treatise which Photius calls a *bibliदारion*, being really a volume containing ten *biblia*, its not beginning as our Hippolytus begins, nor ending as it ends, and containing something which it does not contain in reference to the celebration of Easter and the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Dr. Wordsworth advances some reasons for believing that the work of Hippolytus really existed in a smaller and a larger form. In the introduction to the newly-discovered treatise, Hippolytus says, "We expounded the dogmas of the heretics some time ago (*πάλαι*) with brevity, not exhibiting them in detail, but refuting them rather in rude generality, not thinking it would be necessary to drag their secrets to the light. But since they have no feeling of regard for our moderation, I am constrained to come forward and exhibit in detail the dogmas of them all." Further, a diffi-

culty had arisen from the circumstance that, according to Photius, the treatise of Hippolytus terminated with Noetus and the Noetians; whereas, in that which we have recently recovered, the author occupies a great part of the ninth book with the heresy of Callistus and of the Elchasaites which sprung from it. Now these were subsequent to the heresy of Noetus, and it was natural that, in reproducing his former work in an enlarged edition, Hippolytus should carry it on by including a heresy which had sprung up, not only in his own day, but under his own eyes, and which he had a principal share in putting down. The first and compendious work was derived from the notes which Hippolytus had taken of the lectures of his master, Irenæus; the second, from his published work, which was finished about A.D. 100, and ended with the Noetians. Bunsen adopts the suggestion which was first brought forward in the Ecclesiastic, and it will probably be received as a satisfactory solution of the difficulty.

On the question of the canon of the New Testament in the days of Hippolytus, we do not perceive that any new light has been thrown by the discussion which Bunsen's publication has excited. He had not only asserted that Hippolytus did not receive the Second Epistle of Peter, but that the ancient churches did not know such a letter. Dr. Wordsworth quotes from a Homily of Origen, who was born somewhat later than Hippolytus, the expression—"Petrus *duabus* epistolarum personat tubis." This shews that Origen knew of a Second Epistle; but it is an unfair straining of Bunsen's words to understand them as meaning that no individual Christian received it. The Church, as a Church, certainly did not receive it. Eusebius reckons it among the *antilegomena*, and Jerome admits that its genuineness was generally called in question. The solemn indignation of Dr. Wordsworth is ludicrous: "Since the author of that Epistle claims to be St. Peter himself, and since the Church receives the Epistle as his, M. Bunsen has ventured on an act of irreverence and injustice. He has suborned St. Hippolytus as an accuser of the Christian Church, and charges her through him with reading as canonical the work of an impostor!"

Bunsen himself appears to admit that none of our Gospels existed before the destruction of Jerusalem: "The first decennium after that event," he says, "gave birth to the three Gospels which bear the names of Matthew, Mark and Luke" (I. 35, 2nd ed.). His opponents complain, and not altogether without reason, that his very positive enunciations are sometimes wholly unaccompanied with proof. The time of the publication of the three first Gospels is one of the most disputable points in early Christian history, and the reader will naturally be curious to know how all this obscurity has suddenly vanished, and their appearance been fixed to A.D. 70—80. No evidence whatever is offered; it is only said "that there was a necessity that such

accounts as ours should have been written in the first ten years after the destruction of Jerusalem. When it had fallen, and the prospect of a further continuation of the life of this world opened upon Christians, they found themselves thrown more than ever upon the person and life of Christ." We apprehend that those who hold a much later origin of the Gospels, would make very light of this argument, and ask how it appeared that the contemporary Christians saw the destruction of Jerusalem in the same point of view in which subsequent history places it to us, namely, as the commencement of a new era; and why Matthew, Mark and Luke, must all have rushed into authorship in the first ten years after that event, to meet the wants which it created. For ourselves, we ask, on the other hand, what is the proof or reasonable presumption that no desire for an authentic narrative of our Lord's life existed among his disciples *before* the destruction of Jerusalem, and why may not our three first Gospels have been written to satisfy that desire? Has Dr. Bunsen forgotten the poem to Luke—"Forasmuch as *many* have taken in hand," &c.—or does he suppose that the wonderful fertility of one troubled decennium produced all these, in addition to the canonical Gospels? But if, before the fall of Jerusalem, the affection and curiosity of Christians had led them to desire memorials of their Lord's ministry, and inaccurate works had been produced to gratify these feelings, why should not an apostle, or the companion of an apostle, have stepped forth then to supply an authentic Gospel? The restriction to a period of ten years is not only quite arbitrary, but in itself very improbable. A singular reason is indeed assigned why the three first Gospels* could not have been written before A.D. 65: "Though eye-witnesses might have ventured to give an unchronological account of events they had seen, they could not propose an arrangement seemingly chronological, but in reality irreconcilable with the chronological order. Such, however, is the relation which the first Gospel, as well as the two others, and the chronological groundwork common to them all, bear to that of St. John, the undoubted author of the fourth." This is another fine limitation of time, the grounds of which we confess ourselves unable to perceive. We will not enter here into the question of the discrepant chronology of John's Gospel and that of the other evangelists, though, if compelled to consider them as irreconcilable, we should choose to adhere to the older authority in preference to the later.† But, granting that John is right and the others wrong, why was it pos-

* Vol. I. p. 35. The remark is applied immediately to the hypothesis of a protevangelium; but it bears just as strongly on our three first Gospels, and is applied by the author to them.

† St. Luke must be held to have boasted without cause when he speaks of himself as παρακολουθηκώς ἀνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς (i. 3), if he has made a mistake of two years in the duration of our Lord's ministry.

sible for them to compose and publish a narrative, false in its chronology, after the year 70, but impossible before 65? Had all the eye-witnesses who could have convicted them of their error died off in the interval, or perished in the destruction of Jerusalem? One supposition contradicts the laws of nature, and the other the testimony of history, which informs us that few Christians suffered by that event. Dr. Bunsen explains the coincidences of the synoptical Gospels (I. p. 37), by the supposition of a body of oral catechetical instruction in the life of our Saviour, which has served as the basis of them all. We think the supposition (which he does not advance as original) wholly inadequate to explain these coincidences; they indicate the existence of a written document. But waving this question, since there must have been some time at which the oral tradition was reduced to writing, what fixes that time to the narrow limits within which Dr. Bunsen would confine it? The poems of Homer, or the national poetry of the Calmucks, may have been transmitted orally for many generations, for want of pen and ink; but the disciples, whether Jews or Gentiles, were familiar with the art of writing, and had its materials ready at hand; and why should they have trusted to memory, when they could so easily put their traditions of their Master's sayings and doings in the safety of a written record?

Of St. John and the authorship of his various works, Dr. Bunsen entertains some rather singular opinions. His Gospel, he says, was certainly written in the last decennium of the first century and at Ephesus, and published by the elders of the church in that city. "As in the life and writings of Paul, so in those of St. John, we clearly discern two periods. In the Apocalypse (which Bunsen supposes to have been written A.D. 68, after the death of Nero) we see his ardent mind subject to prophetic ecstasies; in his Gospel and Epistle we behold the calm teacher, the disciple of love. This difference is independent of another circumstance which may help to explain the contrast as to language. I mean the difference between a Jewish secretary who may have acted the part of an amanuensis in committing the vision to writing, and whose style would naturally be hebraizing and barbarous, and the men of Asia Minor, the Bishops and Elders of the Greek cities, who edited his Gospel in good Hellenistic Greek" (I. 50). We shall not inquire into the psychological probability of the change supposed to be wrought in the evangelist; among other reasons, because we see no more cause to conclude that the author of the Apocalypse was subject to prophetic ecstasies, than that the author of the Pilgrim's Progress was a great dreamer. The vision in the one case, the dream in the other, is only the vesture of the thought. But the notion that the difference in style between the Gospel of John and the Apocalypse is owing to an amanuensis, is one of the

most extraordinary that we have met with. We have hitherto considered it as the duty of an amanuensis to write to his master's dictation. We should have been surprised if in the controversy respecting the genuineness of certain orations of Cicero, it had been alleged that the difference in style between the oration *pro Milone* and that *pro Domo sua* was owing to Cicero's employing two different amanuenses. Dr. Bunsen's supposition represents the evangelist to us in the helpless condition of a low Italian of the present day, who, unable to indite a letter, betakes himself to the *scrivano*, by whom his purposes are endowed with words, according to the measure of his own literary ability. We are not sure that we understand the part assigned to the Bishops and Elders; "they edited John's Gospel in good Hellenistic Greek." Does this mean that St. John wrote it in bad Greek, and that they put it into good Greek? How can we be sure of the incorruptness of a document which has passed through such a process, or how reconcile such an operation with their solemn words, "This is the disciple which wrote these things"? If all that is meant is that St. John wrote good Hellenistic Greek, and they edited his Gospel as he left it, there is an unhappy ambiguity in our author's phrase.

Before leaving the subject of the canon and text of the New Testament, we may observe, that Dr. Bunsen has fallen under the high displeasure of Dr. Wordsworth, for a very innocent and just remark respecting its interpolations. He had said, "that the Sacred Text has been adulterated with dishonest or untenable readings and interpretations," and that "supposititious words and verses have been foisted into them." On this Dr. Wordsworth thus comments:

"By 'verses foisted in for a particular purpose, and on which certain definitions of the ancient Church have been founded,' it is probable that M. Bunsen means 1 John v. 7. Did M. Bunsen ever read Bentley's Letter on that subject? (Correspondence, II. 529). His general insinuation of supposititious verses and dishonest readings, and consequently of uncertainty in the Sacred Text, is a repetition of the charge made by Antony Collins, in another form, against the integrity of the Gospels as altered, 'tanquam ab idiotis Evangelistis composita,' which was refuted so triumphantly by the same writer, Dr. Bentley, 'On Free-thinking,' Cambr., 1743, p. 112."

We think we can answer for Dr. Bunsen, that when he spoke of supposititious verses and dishonest readings, he referred not only to 1 John v. 7, but to the substitution of *God* for *who* in 1 Tim. iii. 16, and of *God* for *Lord* in Acts xx. 28; nor can there be any reasonable doubt that these changes were dishonestly made, as they are now dishonestly retained, to make Scripture speak the language of ecclesiastical definitions. Dr. Wordsworth does not venture to defend the genuineness of 1 John v. 7, and contents himself with asking if Bunsen has read a certain

letter of Bentley's. In that letter, written with great reserve, Bentley declines to say whether he shall or shall not insert the text in his edition, but comforts his alarmed correspondent with the assurance that, whatever becomes of the text, the doctrine is safe. It would have been strange if the Master of Trinity and Prebendary of Worcester had avowed a different opinion. But although Bentley's edition never appeared, Dr. Wordsworth, an old Trinity man, must surely have read Porson's Letters, and have seen there that Bentley delivered a public lecture to prove the verse spurious.* We hope, too, that he has read a letter addressed to Bentley in the page following that which he quotes, in which another correspondent, hearing that he was engaged on a critical edition of the New Testament, conjures him *for the honour of orthodoxy* to omit the spurious verse.† "The blessed Trinity require it at your hands in vindication of their honour and of the truth of those sacred oracles they have graciously given, as the sole rule of doctrine for men, and which ought to be freed from a spurious interlineation foisted therein. Religion demands it, which has already but too much suffered, through such indirect, villanous and pernicious practices; all learned men expect it, knowing your great abilities in critical learning; lastly, the souls of millions of mankind implore it from you, who have suffered and are daily suffering in doctrines relating to their eternal salvation." Without regarding the consequences in so very serious a light as this writer, we must say that the retention of this text in the Authorized Version is a flagrant inconsistency in the Heads of a Church whose watchword (against the Catholics) is, "The Scriptures, the whole Scriptures, and nothing but the Scriptures." Dr. Wordsworth's insinuation in the close of the note which we have quoted, that Bunsen has revived the old cavil of Collins, respecting the corruption of the text of the New Testament, is without the smallest foundation, a mere effusion of theological malice.

Dr. Bunsen had noticed how far short of Athanasian orthodoxy the doctrine of Hippolytus respecting the nature of Christ falls, and had called the statement of Christianity with which he winds up his tenth book his "Confession of Faith."‡ To this title Dr. Wordsworth (171) objects, that Hippolytus is addressing Heathens, and that we must not expect to find *there* an exposition of Christian doctrine; and he quotes from a Homily, *supposed* to be by Hippolytus, a fuller statement, amounting

* Porson's Letters to Travis, Pref. p. viii.

† Bentley's Corresp., II. p. 532. We doubt whether J. Shaw, who signs this letter, was not a heretic in disguise. Can any of our readers give information about him, if the name represent a real person, or about the pamphlet which he quotes: "A full Inquiry into the original Authority of the Text, 1 John v. 7, &c. Printed for J. Baker, at the Black Boy, in Paternoster Row, 1715, and sold by J. Darby, in Bartholomew Close"?

‡ Hippolytus concludes his statement by saying, *Τοιαύτη ἡ καὶ ἡμᾶς πίστις*.

after all to nothing more than that every one who was baptized confessed Christ to be God. He again supplies the deficiency of his own supplement, by another Homily *supposed* to be by Hippolytus, in which he speaks of a Trinity. Now it is hardly fair to tax Bunsen with misrepresentation, because in speaking of Hippolytus' theology as it appears in the newly-recovered treatise, he had not taken into account two other works of questionable genuineness. According to Dr. Wordsworth, the address to the Heathens must be considered as an exoteric statement of Christian doctrine, in which the deeper mysteries of faith are not to be expected. We think we know what judgment he would pass on a Jesuit missionary who should practise such reserve in publishing his Gospel. Hippolytus professes the object of his summary to be, "that heathens and those who have adopted heresies may recognize the power of truth and be saved by worthy faith in God." If any heathen or heretic, taking him at his word, embraced Christianity or orthodoxy according to his statement, and found too late that it was deficient in some doctrines, the belief of which was essential to salvation, the saint must have incurred an awful responsibility.

In one point Dr. Bunsen has been corrected by his critic. He had rendered the words of Hippolytus, in speaking of the Logos, τοῦτον μόνον ἐξ ὄντων ἐγέννα, "him alone of all things he begat," whereas the context shews that it should be, "him alone he begat out of things which existed," the Father being τὸ ὄν, the only real existence, and all the elements being produced ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων. Nor can we be surprised that he declines to accept a conjecture of Bunsen's on another passage. Hippolytus says, Χριστὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ κατὰ πάντων Θεός, ὃς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀποπλύνειν προσέταξε. Bunsen omits the ὃς after Θεός, and reads ὃ ὁ κ. π.δ. προσέταξε, alleging that he could not have said that Christ was the Father, as the words in the present text imply, and that Christ nowhere orders men to wash off sins. To the first objection Dr. Wordsworth replies, "Why should he not call Christ God over all, when in many other places he has called him God, and St. Paul (Rom. ix. 5) has called him God over (ἐπὶ) all?" He cannot be ignorant, however, that there is a wide difference between the two phrases, "God" and "God over all;" and if he had read Wetstein's note on this passage, he would have seen how many of the Fathers deny that Christ is called "God over all," Ignatius even declaring that those who call him so are "servants of Satan." In a case of pure philological criticism, we think there could be no doubt that they either read or pointed this passage differently. Among those who denied this title to Christ is Hippolytus himself (see Wetstein). A more candid reason, therefore, might have been found for Bunsen's conjecture than a desire "to corrupt a testimony of Hippolytus to the deity of Christ." Equally uncandid is the imputation of

desiring to get rid of a testimony to the efficacy of baptism. That Christ never in the New Testament commands to wash away sin from among men is certain; how far such a command may be inferred from his apostles' representing baptism as accompanied by washing away sin (Acts xxii. 16), and his commanding his apostles to baptize all nations (Matt. xxviii. 19), is a fair subject for discussion; taken together, we think they explain, if they do not warrant, the assertion of Hippolytus according to the present text, and render the conjecture of Bunsen unnecessary. But it is an odious spirit which is for ever seeking to throw suspicion on the motives of an opponent.

Dr. Wordsworth will not allow that the silence of Hippolytus concerning infant baptism is any argument against it; and certainly negative arguments should always be cautiously applied. But his own positive argument is curiously illogical, and indeed turns against himself. "He was dealing mainly with adult idolaters. Nothing can be clearer than that he dates the origin of spiritual life from baptism; and therefore, according to his teaching, they who have the charge of infants and children are bound to bring them to baptism, if they would not have the blood of their souls (!) required of themselves, by Him who instituted Baptism as the laver of the new birth" (p. 173). We will not attribute the awkward ambiguity of this sentence to anything but confused writing, though there is considerable danger that a hasty reader should understand "according to his teaching" to mean that Hippolytus taught the awful doctrine which follows, whereas it only means that Dr. Wordsworth draws this inference from his teaching. The just inference would be precisely the reverse. Hippolytus dates the new life from baptism; but the baptism of which he speaks is the baptism of adults, which was accompanied by a renunciation of idolatry, a confession of sin and a profession of faith; and as infants can make none of these, his teaching has no reference to them. We would by no means be understood to deny the existence of infant baptism in the early church; we believe it to have been coeval with the formation of Christian families, as distinguished from congregations of adult converts; we only wish to shew how weakly Dr. Wordsworth reasons.

On the subject of the authority of the Church as an interpreter of Scripture, Dr. Wordsworth writes with that vagueness and inconsistency which always beset a man who endeavours to be at once both Catholic and Protestant. Father Newman says that Hippolytus "speaks as if he were ignorant of our Lord's Eternal Sonship, and if we limit our views of his teaching by what he expressly states, was a Photinian," i.e. a Humanitarian, and on this he grounds his doctrine of the necessity of a developing authority in the Church. Dr. Wordsworth holds high Protestant language in opposition to this. "St. Hippolytus and

the other Catholic Fathers acknowledged the Holy Scriptures to be the sole and all-sufficient rule of the Christian Faith; they acknowledged and affirmed that the true Faith, *whole and complete*, is contained in those Scriptures" (p. 187). But then as to what *is* the faith taught in Scripture, *quot ecclesiæ, tot sententiæ*, and to what tribunal are we to appeal? Dr. Wordsworth gives an answer, one half of which is excellent, but it is unfortunately nullified by the other half. We are to ascertain the sense of Scripture

"— by the aid of sound reason, disciplined and informed by learning, and exercised with caution, industry and humility, and enlightened by Divine Grace given to earnest prayer, and controlled and regulated by the judgment and guidance of the Church Universal, to whom Christ has promised his presence and the light of the Holy Spirit to guide her into all truth. Since the personality of the Holy Spirit and the Divine Trinity in Unity are taught in the creeds, we believe that those doctrines are contained in Holy Scripture, *and that they have been in Scripture since the beginning*. Therefore, if it could be shewn that St. Hippolytus, or any other among the ancient Fathers of the Church, had exaggerated a truth through fear of its opposite error, or if, not being gifted with prescience, they did not guard their language against possible misconstruction, in regard to some heresies which did not arise in the Church till many years after they were laid in their graves, or did not fully put forth such transcendental truths as the eternal generation of the Son of God, before those truths had been impugned,—what is all this to us? They received the Holy Scriptures. They received them as the Rule of Faith. They received, therefore, all that is in the Scriptures. They received all that the Church Universal, the Body and Spouse of Christ—to whom he has committed the Scriptures, and whom he has commissioned to guard and interpret them—could shew to be in those Scriptures. They therefore received, by implication and by anticipation, the Three Creeds promulgated lawfully and generally received by the Church."

We should have thought that learning, industry, caution, humility and Divine Grace, were tolerably sufficient to guide a man to all necessary truth; but all these together, even Divine Grace, must be controlled and regulated by the judgment of the Church Universal. And how are we to come at the judgment of this Church Universal? By the language of the creeds. And how are we to know that they speak the sense of the Church Universal?—for there never was a period when the whole body of Christian believers agreed in their interpretation of Scripture. The Church Universal is only a high-sounding name for the party that predominated at a particular era—an aggregate of fallible men, and therefore not capable of giving an infallible judgment. Dr. Wordsworth, like all men who admit the authority of any Church in this matter, argues in a circle: My interpretation is true, because it is sanctioned by the creed; and the creed is true, because it is based on a true interpretation of Scripture.

If we have defended Dr. Bunsen in most points from his chief opponent, it is not because we have been bribed by any encomiums upon our own creed, of which he gives the following account (Vol. I. p. 81):

“If Christ’s nature be not identical with the Divine nature, but only similar to it, there is an end of the Christian religion. For religion rests, under whatever form, upon the assumption that divine and human reason are identical, only with the difference between the Infinite and the Finite. This may be expressed imperfectly, but it must not be negated. The appearance of such a negation killed Arianism as much as the imperfections of its own positive theory, which would have made of the history of Christ a mythological fiction, and would have led to hero-worship, demonology, or any idolatrous worship. The dry Unitarianism of the eighteenth century is the first real negation, and has proved itself to be as incapable of explaining the history of Christ, as the intellectual mystery of man and mankind. As religion, it cannot pretend to more than a latitudinarian Mohammedanism, or at most a denationalized Judaism; in short, to modern Deism, taking Christ as a moral model. Such, however, is not the Unitarianism of some of the present leaders of that denomination in England.”

We are not told what *is* the Unitarianism of some of the present leaders of the denomination, and should have been glad to have been informed. But we know pretty well what was the Unitarianism which to Dr. Bunsen appears so dry and so like Mohammedanism, Judaism and Deism. It was the doctrine announced by Peter, as the first utterance of the Spirit newly received on the day of Pentecost, that “Jesus of Nazareth was a man approved of God by miracles, signs and wonders,”—a doctrine preached by him and his fellow-apostles according to the book of Acts, and by which “the word of God mightily grew and prevailed.” And, as far as we can make out, it is substantially the creed of Dr. Bunsen himself, only cleared of a little hazy phraseology. The following are his words, Vol. I. p. 303 of this edition:

“The life of Christ does not simply exhibit to us the most sublime moral teaching, but all his works and precepts centre in that which constitutes him, on the one side, the Son of God in an unparalleled sense, and, on the other, the brother and ensample of all mankind. Christ is the Son of God by the constant presence of the Divine Spirit, and by that conscious self-sacrifice of which his whole life formed one act and his death was the seal. Christ is the Son of Man—not a Jew, not a Gentile, but a Man, the eternal model of Humanity. These two views are inseparably united; for Jesus is the Son of Man, as being an infallible mirror of that Divine Love which created the world, and which presides over the destinies of mankind.”

What is there in this which a Unitarian might not adopt as the expression of his belief? “Christ is the Son of God by the constant presence of the Divine Spirit.” What Unitarian does not admit that “the Spirit was given to him without mea-

sure," and that, in virtue of it, "the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in him"? If so, what do we gain by calling Christ's nature identical with the Divine nature, except an apparent approximation to the language of orthodoxy, with a great loss in distinctness of ideas? We know not, indeed, what scriptural evidence Dr. Bunsen has for saying, that Christ was the Son of God by "his conscious self-sacrifice;" we recollect no passage in which his sonship and his sacrifice are connected together; but that his life was a life of self-sacrifice, that his death was its seal, and that in virtue of that sacrifice he is entitled to our warmest love and deepest veneration, is the universal doctrine of Unitarian Christians, as far as we are acquainted with their writing or their preaching. That Unitarianism is only Deism, with Christ as a moral model, is a trite calumny, which we regret that Dr. Bunsen should have adopted. The Deist, however he may admire the moral virtues of Christ, admits no supernatural power, no superhuman wisdom, to have belonged to him. The Unitarian of the eighteenth century, and we believe of the nineteenth with rare exceptions, regards his teachings as the suggestions of that divine wisdom which he derived not from identity of nature with the Father, but from the constant influence of his Spirit. Is this difference to be considered as nothing? Dr. Bunsen himself regards St. John's doctrine of the Logos as the living principle of Christian faith; but he should have considered that Christianity had existed for nearly three-quarters of a century, before this *philosophema* of the Judæo-Platonic school made its appearance in the proem to the fourth Gospel. It is only a peculiar mode of expressing that intimate communion of the mind of Christ with the mind of the Father, in which the Unitarian believes as fully as the Athanasian. It is not the language of Christ himself, nor of the first preachers of the Gospel, and from its introduction we may date the origin of endless controversies, persecutions and schisms.

K.

CHARACTER OF QUEEN ANNE.

SHE was a very weak woman, full of prejudices, fond of flattery, always governed blindly by some female favourite, and, as Swift bitterly observes, "had not a stock of amity to serve above one object at a time." Can it be necessary to waste many words upon the mind of a woman who could give as a reason—a lady's reason!—for dismissing a cabinet minister, that he had appeared before her in a tie-wig instead of a full-bottom? Is it not evident that in such a case we must study the advisers, and not the character of a sovereign—that we must look to the setting rather than the stone?—*Lord Mahon's History of England*, I. 30.

ESSAY ON ECCLESIASTICAL ARCHITECTURE AS ADAPTED TO THE UNITARIAN CHURCH.

[The Committee who proposed a Prize of Ten Guineas for the best Essay on the above subject, did so in the hope that among the competitors some one might be found who should indicate a style of architecture more entirely suitable for Unitarian worship, and more thoroughly imbued with the Unitarian spirit, than is the heathen Grecian on the one hand, the symbolizing Gothic on the other.

This hope was perhaps too sanguine; at any rate, it has been disappointed.

One Essay alone, starting from the high truths of Unitarian Christianity, suggested, and with considerable eloquence, an architecture which the author conceived would embody in outward form the beauty and grandeur of the Unitarian faith. The *conclusions*, however, at which the author of this Essay arrived, seemed to the Committee so unsound and so little practical, that they could not feel justified in awarding him the Prize.

Another Essay of great merit, while ably criticizing the faults of those Gothic churches which the Unitarian body has recently erected, proposed no substitute, and in fact left the question for which the Essay had been written entirely unanswered.

Of the remaining Essays, which for the most part advocated the claims of the Gothic style, two were peculiarly noticeable, and between these two the Committee felt much difficulty in deciding. They believe, however, that Mr. Bowman's Essay at once keeps the most closely to the subject, and most fairly and completely states the arguments in favour of the adoption of Gothic architecture in our churches.

The Committee have felt great pleasure in awarding to Mr. Henry A. Darbishire, of London, an additional Prize of Five Guineas.

The remaining Essays (six in number) will be returned, on application to Mr. Whitfield, Strand, London.

Liverpool, Dec. 8, 1854.]

WHAT FORM OF ECCLESIASTICAL ARCHITECTURE IS BEST ADAPTED TO THE
REQUIREMENTS, AND MOST CONSONANT WITH THE SPIRIT, OF THE UNITA-
RIAN CHURCH?

By Mr. HENRY BOWMAN, Architect.

BEFORE a satisfactory answer can be given to this question, it will be necessary to define, as clearly as we can, what is meant by the "Spirit of the Unitarian Church." The peculiar constitution of that church renders it somewhat difficult to express by words in what its spirit consists. Locke describes a church as a voluntary society of men, who join themselves together, of their own accord, for the public worship of God, in such a manner as they judge acceptable to Him, and effectual to the salvation of their own souls. Though agreeing on certain broad principles, the individuals composing such societies are, however, not supposed to be of one mind on all points, either of doctrine or of worship. The fixed creeds and articles by which they bind

themselves into a church, are generally framed in such ambiguous phrases as admit of variety of interpretation by different minds.

The futility of attempting to enforce perfect uniformity of belief on theological subjects is abundantly shewn, not only by the fact of the Christian church being divided into such numberless sections, but by the history of almost every one of these separate bodies. Even such churches as actually forbid and disclaim all right of private judgment or personal inquiry in theological questions, claiming for their creeds the stamp of immutable truth, and the sanction of divine authority, are not exempt from such diversities among their own members, even on points considered by them as of primary importance. Fear of incurring the penalties attached to heretical error is sufficient to deter most men from either avowing doubts or attempting to remove them by free investigation.

If in such churches, bound to fixed forms of faith by rigid authority and severe penalties, uniformity of belief cannot be insured, still less can it be looked for in that other body of Christians whose chief characteristic is freedom from all fixed formulæ of belief, and who hold unfettered inquiry and progress in opinion to be their most sacred right and privilege.

But how shall we define the spirit of a church in which scarcely two individuals can be found holding precisely the same views on all points? The Unitarian has in truth a creed as fixed and definite as that of other Christians; but it embraces simply the belief in those great and immutable truths accepted by all churches, but which are by most of them thrust aside to make way for complicated and doubtful theological systems, adherence to which forms the chief bond of union among their members.

The spirit of the Unitarian church may then be defined as one of simplicity and rationality of belief,—individual freedom of inquiry on religious matters,—and unity of faith in the broad and fundamental principles which it holds as the essence of the divine revelation made to man by Jesus Christ.

Now, the objects for which a number of individuals holding such a faith will unite themselves to form a church are twofold. 1st, To stimulate and encourage each other in the maintenance of the particular form of Christianity which they hold to be the best and truest, and to promote its diffusion among the community at large; and, 2nd, To provide for the celebration of social worship, in a manner congenial with their faith and feelings. It is with the latter that we are now chiefly concerned; for it alone renders necessary the provision of an edifice set apart for that special purpose.

As in doctrine, so in worship, is the Unitarian church unfettered by authoritative uniformity, and each separate congregation adopts that particular form most consonant with its own feelings: one has a single liturgy, another a series of liturgies, and a third

no liturgy at all : but, while differing in form, they are all actuated by the same religious spirit.

Before examining into the particular forms of architecture applicable to the purpose in question, it is proper that we should be fully impressed with the sanctity of such a purpose, and the importance of giving to the house set apart for the worship of God, such a distinctive outward aspect as will best display its character. The general form, as well as every separate part, should have an intelligible meaning, in harmony with its purpose.

As there can be no true art without a basis of truth, so no architecture can be good which does not visibly proclaim its object and suitably impress the beholder. In giving to a building the form best adapted to its purpose, irrespective of any particular style of architecture, we necessarily impart to it a character in harmony with that purpose ; and it then becomes, with the artist, a vehicle for exciting the appropriate emotions by purification and embellishment. But this harmony between the purpose and outward aspect of a building should not be the motive and end, but rather the natural accompaniment of the fulfilment of certain primary conditions of utility.

If such principles are essential to all good architecture, they are peculiarly necessary in the case of that consecrated to sacred purposes. The history of Religion and the history of Art, from the earliest times, may be said to run in parallel lines, and bear equal testimony to the intimate union between religious belief and religious architecture. All the great styles of antiquity may indeed be traced to this powerful sentiment in the human mind.

A very cursory glance at the various styles of architecture made use of by the Christian church at different periods, will assist us in arriving at the proper answer to the proposed question.

On the first toleration of Christianity by Constantine, the only buildings in Rome which could be found affording the requisite amount of accommodation were the civil or judicial Basilicæ. Subsequently, when Theodosius proclaimed Christianity to be the sole religion of the empire, the Pagan temples, thus superseded,—but which were totally unfit for the purposes of Christian worship, partly on account of their small size, but chiefly from the associations connected with them,—were doomed to destruction ; but, on account of the low state of the art of building at that time, their materials furnished a very opportune supply for the erection of the numerous large churches now required.

The form and arrangement of the Roman Basilica had been found so convenient for all the purposes of Christian worship, that it was still followed in all these new structures ; and, in fact, the same general type has been followed, with slight modifications, in the majority of churches in Christendom to the present time. In the ground-plan of the Basilica may be traced

the germ of the division of a church into centre and side aisles by rows of pillars,—of the transepts, the chancel for the singers, and the sanctuary for the clergy, all which, though used originally for other and civil purposes, answered in a remarkable manner for the sacred purposes to which they were now applied.*

In these first churches, the roofs were, like their prototypes, of wood; but soon the desire arose of covering them with the more substantial and durable stone vault. But the weight and thrust of this vault necessitated other changes, such as strengthening the pillars and walls; and the pillars were now connected by semi-circular arches, instead of the horizontal entablature used before, and were consequently allowed to be placed at considerably greater distances apart, thus offering less obstruction on the floor. These various changes, with others consequent upon them, ultimately led to the formation of the style of ecclesiastical architecture which by the seventh century had spread over a large part of Europe, and prevailed, with slight variations in different countries, until the eleventh century.

The style is thus characterized by Dr. Whewell: "A more or less close imitation of the features of Roman architecture. The arches are round—are supported on pillars retaining traces of the classical proportions; the pilasters, cornices and entablatures, have a correspondence with those of classical architecture; there is a prevalence of rectangular faces and square-edged projections; the openings in walls are small, and subordinate to the surfaces in which they occur; the members of the architecture are massive and heavy, very limited in kind and repetition, the enrichments being introduced rather by sculpturing surfaces than by multiplying and extending the component parts. There is a predominance of *horizontal* lines, or at least no predominance or prolongation of *vertical* ones."† This style has been designated by various writers as the Romanesque, the Lombard and the Norman.

The development and perfecting of this first style of Christian architecture must be undoubtedly ascribed to the Christian missionaries and clergy (and their associated body, the free-masons), by whom the conversion of the several countries was effected.

Notwithstanding the wide diffusion of the Romanesque style, and its manifest beauty and fitness for the purposes with which it appeared to be permanently associated, it was nevertheless destined to be superseded by another, yet more beautiful, and more completely expressive of the inmost life and spirit of that Christian faith to which, in fact, the perfection of both styles was due.

The sudden rise of the Pointed or Gothic style in the latter

* See a very able article on this subject in the Quarterly Review, Vol. LXXV. p. 334.

† Whewell's "German Churches," p. 47.

half of the twelfth century, and its almost simultaneous appearance in different and distant parts of Christendom, is one of the most curious and interesting problems in the whole range of architectural inquiry. The power, wealth and influence of the clergy at this time exceeded those of any other class, and they maintained and extended this power by the erection of numerous costly churches, for which they procured without difficulty almost unlimited resources,—gifts to the church being in those times considered equivalent to services rendered to God, and the sacrifice of all earthly possessions the surest passport to heaven. Moreover, the struggles of the different communities of monks to outvie each other in the splendour of their churches, and their desire of overawing the ignorant laity, caused unwonted activity of invention among the body of the free-masons, whose whole energies were thus concentrated on this one object; while, by the free communication kept up among the different companies of their body, every improvement and advance was rapidly known to the whole fraternity.*

Under such circumstances, it is not surprising that very rapid strides should have been made towards the perfection of ecclesiastical architecture.

This new "Pointed" style is described by Dr. Whewell as "characterized by the pointed arch; by pillars which are extended so as to lose all trace of classical proportions; by shafts which are placed side by side, often with different thicknesses, and are variously clustered and combined. Its mouldings, cornices and capitals, have no longer the classical shapes and members; square edges, rectangular surfaces, pilasters and entablatures, disappear; the elements of building become slender, detached, repeated and multiplied; they assume forms implying flexure and ramification; the openings become the principal part of the wall, and the other portions are subordinate to these. The universal tendency is to the predominance and prolongation of *vertical* lines."† Buttresses, pinnacles, shafted pillars, richly-moulded door and window jambs, towers and spires, are made the most prominent features; while the necessary horizontal lines of string courses, cornices, &c., are made of slight projection and subordinate importance.

The origin of the pointed arch and other peculiar features of the style, has been a subject of much controversy; but it is not of much importance to our present inquiry. Whatever the original source, there can be little doubt that the rapid development of the Pointed style was the result of certain manifest and proved advantages which it possessed over that which preceded it. In all great architectural changes, constructive necessity has been

* Hope's *Essay on Architecture*, ch. xxxii.

† Whewell's "German Churches," p. 49.

the first and most powerful motive, and it may reasonably be supposed to have been so in the present instance.

Now, one result of the general *vertical* tendency just spoken of was, that every part of the buildings, but especially the towers, were carried to an immense height, and it would very soon be found that the semi-circular arch did not possess sufficient strength to bear the great weight thus laid upon it. In a period of such architectural activity, the builders would not be long in discovering that the pointed arch (the mere *form* of which must have been known to them before) was not only the strongest they could adopt, but also the simplest, the most beautiful, and most in harmony with the direction in which the whole of their architecture was tending.

To these, among other causes, must be attributed the interesting change in ecclesiastical architecture of which we are now speaking. The principle of the pointed arch was the key to the whole style, and to it and its necessary accompaniments can be traced the origin of all its essential features.

It will be unnecessary to notice the various stages through which this wonderful style passed, from the simplicity of its earliest form up to the exuberance of its full maturity, appropriately called by Dr. Whewell the "Complete Gothic," or the later modifications which preceded its decline. It is sufficient here to say that, by the end of the fifteenth century, it had suffered serious degradation, and that a century and a half later witnessed its utter neglect and abandonment. One remarkable circumstance has been noticed by Dr. Whewell, "that the English architects should have gone by a path of their own to the consummation of Gothic architecture, and should on the road have discovered a style, full of beauty and unity, and quite finished in itself, which escaped their German brother-artists,"* viz., the style usually termed "Early English." He also notices the fact that, while "different nations converged by different paths to a sort of central idea of Gothic, it appears that they afterwards diverged, and formed out of this common style various degenerate kinds of architecture, different in different countries." Of these derivations of the pure Gothic, he considers the English "Perpendicular" to be the "most beautiful and least degenerate," and "scarcely inferior to any form of Gothic architecture."†

Few words will suffice to trace the course of ecclesiastical architecture, after the abandonment of the Pointed style. With few exceptions, the churches built since that time, till within the last quarter of a century, exhibit an almost total ignorance of the true principles of the art. The discarded style was as much as possible avoided; and while the principles of no other style were understood, the want of skill in the builders could

* Whewell's "German Churches," p. 23.

† P. 38.

only be made up for by the borrowing of miscellaneous details and ornaments from Greek, Roman and other ancient buildings, without regard either to their original position or their meaning. Such a course would certainly not be expected to lead to the formation of a pure and consistent system of architecture.

Within the last twenty-five years, an important movement has been going on in the revival of the Gothic or Pointed style for ecclesiastical purposes. It is difficult to say to what immediate causes this movement is due; but probably the train had been for some time laid, and the materials ready at hand to feed the flame of enthusiasm in its favour, whenever circumstances should arise to apply the spark. So little life, indeed, existed in the degenerate style previously in use, that anything exhibiting genuine and simple truth would be sure to be welcomed when understood.

Nor has this adoption of the ancient style been confined to any particular section of the Christian church, being marked by the erection of large and costly places of worship by Independents, Methodists and Unitarians, as well as by the Church of England and Roman Catholics, some of them indicating an intimate knowledge of the true principles of the style. Among these bodies, the Unitarians have not been either the least zealous or the least successful, as some of their recent erections testify.

This brief review of the origin and development of the different styles of ecclesiastical architecture, will furnish us with the materials out of which to make our selection of that which is best suited to the purpose in question. That selection, after what has been already said, must of course fall upon the Pointed or Gothic. The short sketch we have been able to give of its history and character, will, it is presumed, satisfy the majority of minds of the propriety of our choice.

No style is so truthful, so simple in its principles, or so various in its capabilities; none is so essentially founded on the laws of nature and sound mechanical construction. Contrary to the classical systems, it was, both in its origin and in its developments, designed in the first place for *interior* accommodation rather than for *external* display. It is the genuine growth of the Christian faith, and all its associations are with Christianity and its rites. But it is needless to enlarge further on its excellences, as probably few will be found to dispute its decided superiority over all others, considered in itself. It will be necessary, however, to examine one or two circumstances which in some minds tend to render this style unfitted for modern purposes, or at any rate for use by Unitarians.

1. It is objected by some that the Gothic or Pointed style is suited only for the Roman Catholic church, because it was invented and brought to perfection in Catholic times, and made

to accord with the Catholic ritual; that as much of this ritual is superstitious, erroneous and mischievous, while all genuine styles of architecture (and especially this one) are necessarily symbolical of the faith with which they are connected, it is therefore concluded that such a style is totally unsuited for ministering to the pure doctrine and simple worship which is professed and practised by the Unitarian church.

Though plausible, this objection admits of an easy reply. For, 1st, the circumstances under the influence of which the Pointed style arose, had no necessary or immediate connection with Popery or the See of Rome. The foundation of the plan for so many ages adopted for Christian churches, viz., the Roman Basilica, was originally selected simply from motives of *convenience*, and every change which the character of the churches subsequently underwent was called forth by considerations of either splendour of effect, or increased accommodation, or economy of material, or other wants, in which nothing like Papal influence can be traced. It is no doubt true that in all this we may recognize the immense influence of the Christian Priesthood. But we would ask, how could Christianity, even in its debased form, have ever taken root among the rude and ignorant populations of Europe, but for this same priesthood? And their subsequent abuse of this influence is only what perhaps any body of men would have allowed under similar circumstances. The grand and sublime, as well as the lowly and simple, qualities of this style, are (putting aside particularities not essential) undoubtedly not the property of any particular party, but of Catholic Christianity. They are the offspring of the sublime and ennobling truths and faith of the Gospel, stirring up in men's minds and hearts a burning desire to do their best, and consecrate their highest faculties to render God's Temples the most chaste, or the most imposing and sublime, structures in the power of man to erect.

Again, if this style had been peculiarly connected or congenial with Popery, we should expect to find it make its first appearance in Rome, where Papal influence would be the most powerful; or at least, even granting that it might have been accidentally invented elsewhere, still, on its introduction to the Christian capital, whither it would soon penetrate, we should expect it to be welcomed and brought into universal use. But instead of this, we find that not only was the style not invented in Rome, nor even in Italy, but that, when introduced into that country from abroad, the soil was so ungenial as not to allow it even to take root. It is a remarkable fact, that the chief Pointed buildings in Italy are the work of German and French architects;* and though there are some fine Tuscan-Gothic buildings in

* Lord Lindsey's History of Christian Art, Vol. II. p. 32.

Italy, it happens, singularly enough, that these are not of an *ecclesiastical*, but of a *civil* class. The *churches* in this style are very inferior to their northern prototypes. Of all the ancient cities of Latin Europe, Rome is the only one in which a real "Pointed" church cannot be found. The inner spirit and living idea of the style seems never to have been carried out or even comprehended.* Some remarks in an able article in the *Quarterly Review* are apt on this point:†—"St. Peter's and the Jesuits' churches at Rome are the proper types and representatives of Papal art; vast, brilliant, gaudy, full of pretension, appealing directly and servilely to the imagination, frittered into incongruous details, which it is vainly endeavoured to hold together by a composition rationalistic in reality, while it aspires to an assumption of religion; in fact, a republication of heathen architecture without its simplicity, and emblematic of a heathen mind, veiled under the garb of Christianity."

And, again, the falsity of the notion that the beauties of the Pointed style owed their origin to the Papal, and not to the Catholic spirit, "might be shewn at once by pointing out not only the natural connection between true Catholic principles and true taste in art; but the similar analogy between the pretensions, exaggerated fancies, appeals to human nature in its corrupt forms, and mixed incongruities of greatness and meanness, truth and falsehood in Popery, with the same characteristic defects in the architecture which grew up in Italy more immediately under the Papal influence, and which are found less and less prevalent in each country in the same proportion as it was free from the worst tendencies of that fearful usurpation."‡ Another fact may be stated, more within our own immediate cognizance;—the present revival of the Pointed style did not originate in a Catholic country, or among the Roman Catholic body, but in Protestant England, and among Protestants.

2. Again, it is imagined by some that the churches in this style were built for a ritual not accordant with our simple ideas of worship, but consisting of a splendid and complicated ceremonial, long processions, &c.; and this may be very true in reference to the ancient cathedrals, but it is not true with regard to parish churches; for such processions as may have taken place in these were only such as might easily pass along the aisles of our modern churches. In fact, the floors of the ancient parish churches, in this country at least, were covered with fixed benches, just as completely as those of our own day, and the differences between the requirements of the ancient ritual and our own affect chiefly the chancel, but scarcely at all the body of the church. With regard to the internal pillars forming

* Lord Lindsey's *History of Christian Art*, Vol. II. p. 37.

† *Quarterly Review*, Vol. LXIX. p. 140.

‡ *Ibid.* p. 145.

an obstruction to the view, so far from their having any connection with the Roman Catholic ritual, a free and open interior would be full as important for it as for that of any Protestant church. And it may here be remarked by the way, that the proportion of sittings obscured by pillars (which of course are not required at all in very small churches) need not exceed from 1 in 36 to 1 in 20, according as there are one or two rows of pillars.

3. It is supposed by some that there are certain forms and ideas, essential features in this style, which represent and involve doctrines held by Unitarians to be erroneous. There is indeed in some minds a vague antipathy to the idea of embodying special doctrines by visible types, or what is usually understood by the term "symbolism." Now, symbolism is of two kinds, general and special; the first representing abstract qualities, such as Purity, Harmony; and the second, particular ideas, such as the doctrine of the Trinity for instance. To the former we cannot well imagine any solid objection, provided the qualities typified are of a proper kind. In fact, all, but more especially sacred, architecture is essentially symbolical, in this sense, for the abstract ideas of which it is the expression, can only be represented through the medium of sensible types. Architecture and Music differ in this respect from other fine arts, as Painting and Sculpture, which are expressive of definite ideas by means of direct imitation.

Now it is to be remarked that the qualities expressed in the Pointed style of architecture by *general* symbolism, such as truthfulness, purity, simplicity, verticality as indicative of heavenward aspiration, are admitted and approved by all Christians, and have no connection whatever with any particular forms of dogmatic belief.

With regard to the *special* symbolism contained in Pointed architecture, that is the exhibition of particular doctrines and ideas, it cannot be shewn that any one of these has had a real influence on the forms of which that architecture is made up. Particular features (not, however, essential to the style) may doubtless be found which strikingly set forth certain truths. Thus the ground-plan of some churches presents a *cruciform* shape; but even this, which is perhaps the most obvious instance which can be cited, is simply an expansion of the germ originally found in the plan of the Roman Basilica. It is important to notice that, without exception, all those allusions which are obvious and indisputable, refer solely to doctrines and ideas, the truth and value of which are fully and freely admitted by the Unitarian, in common with all other Christians; whereas the supposed allusions to doctrines held by particular sects are not obvious, but, on the contrary, very obscure, and are actually repudiated by many who admit the truth of the doctrines themselves.

In an Introductory Essay prefixed to the translation of the 1st Book of Durandus, by Messrs. J. M. Neale and B. Webb, the nature and extent of this particular symbolism is discussed and defended; and these gentlemen have, it may be presumed, here brought forward all the evidence they could adduce in its favour. The following analysis of the points maintained will enable us to see how far this aspect of the system is worthy of credence:

1. The doctrine of the *Trinity* is said to be typified in the following features of a church: 1. Nave and aisles. 2. Chancel, nave and apse. 3. Clerestory, triforium and pier arches. 4. Triple windows. 5. Altar steps. 6. Triplicity of mouldings. 7. Minor details.* Of these seven symbols of the Trinity, the two first existed quite as strongly marked in the Pagan Basilica as in the Christian Church, and were, in fact, thence derived; the third was an almost inevitable consequence of the necessities of construction; the fourth belongs only to a very small proportion of ancient windows,—coupled windows, and those consisting of four, five, six and more lights, being quite as numerous as those of three; and, in the three last, the reference to the doctrine appears to be purely imaginary.

2. The doctrine of *Regeneration* is symbolized—1, by the octagonal form of fonts and piers; and, 2, by fishes. The octagon signifies regeneration, for the very cogent reason, that “as the old creation was complete in seven days, so the number next ensuing may well be significant of the new.”† Fishes represent the same, because the Christian is born again of water.‡ There is, however, in this, even if true, nothing repugnant to a Unitarian as such.

3. The doctrine of the *Atonement* is typified—1, by cruciformity; 2, deviation of orientation; 3, double cross; 4, the great rood; 5, details. The symbolism, in some of these instances, is admitted at once; but the allusion is not to the Atonement maintained by Trinitarians, but simply to the fact of the crucifixion, believed by all Christians. The idea referred to in the second item—viz., that the fact of the chancel (which represents our Saviour’s head on the cross) being in some few churches slightly bent out of the direct line of the nave (which is his body), indicates the inclination of the head at the moment of death—will be considered by most as somewhat fanciful. The double cross, or second transept east of the main one, as it occurs at Canterbury, is said to signify the metropolitical dignity; but as it happens in some other cathedrals, it is “simply a method of imparting greater dignity to the building.”§ The great rood, as well as numerous ornamental crosses about the ancient churches, are of course instances of direct and intentional symbolism; but the

* Introductory Essay to Durandus on Symbolism, p. xv.

† Ibid. p. lxxxi.

‡ Ibid. p. lxxxii.

§ Ibid. p. lxxxiii.

first is no part of the architecture; and the others, though frequently exquisitely beautiful, are not essential; but no Unitarian, as such, would object to their adoption.

4. *Communion of Saints.* Representations of angels and figures of saints occur in stained glass, on monuments, in niches, &c.; but they form no essential part of the architecture, and may, by those who object to them, be dispensed with altogether. But though the architecture might be complete without figures of any kind, yet it cannot be denied that sculptured figures, when properly introduced, are a very great adornment, especially when placed in ornamental niches.

The above are the main instances of symbolism; but every portion of a church, even to the minutest details, is supposed by some to have had its appropriate symbolical meaning. In some instances, these were both beautiful and expressive, as the idea of the pillars in a church typifying the apostles and doctors; but, in the majority of cases, the allusions were both fanciful and obscure.

Few can fail to perceive that, with a few obvious exceptions, the symbolical allusions,—supposed to belong to particular forms in the ancient churches, especially when the ideas said to be symbolized are not of obvious and undoubted truth,—have attached themselves to previously-existing forms which appeared accidentally to suggest the ideas subsequently said to be typified by them.

In truth, however, Pointed architecture *is* symbolical; but not of any peculiar theological dogmas of this or that particular church, ancient or modern, but of the glorious and fundamental truths of the Christian faith, as held by all true Christian believers alike. It expresses their common belief, hope, trust and aspiration, and is the common property of all who have the eye to discern its beauties, the mind to understand its wondrous science, and the heart to feel its glorious significance.

But still, notwithstanding these numerous recommendations, it may be said that the Pointed style belongs, after all, to a former and different age, and that, in the whole history of art, no instance is known of a successful revival of a style of architecture which had once become totally disused. The *fact* is undoubted; but if we are to admit the argument founded upon it, we are placed in the dilemma of either dispensing with architectural style altogether, or inventing a totally new one for ourselves; for all *known* styles are known only by their remains, and have all passed away, equally with the Gothic, together with the circumstances which called them forth. We imagine no one will be bold enough to recommend the latter alternative, unless he is prepared to say at the same time on what principles it is to be constructed. Besides, the mere fact of the Pointed style having been for a time disused and even despised, is not of itself

sufficient to condemn it, unless this can be shewn to have been the result of inherent imperfection. This, however, cannot be done; on the contrary, its downfall can be clearly traced to a combination of extraneous circumstances, among which the most influential were probably—first, a tendency on the part of the church builders to an excessive ornamentation and elaboration of detail, with a general departure from original purity and grandeur of design in main features. Contemporaneously with this, the laity were beginning to emerge from their state of ignorance, chiefly in consequence of the invention of printing; and, by increased industry and skill, to acquire greater wealth and power, which caused them to feel a desire to emancipate themselves from the influence of the priesthood, under which they had so long lain, and which they now began to feel as an intolerable burden.*

With such causes at work, it is not surprising that the fraternity of the free-masons, so intimately associated with the clergy, should have also been degraded, and deprived of their power and privileges. But their destruction involved also the utter loss to the world of their profound knowledge and consummate skill in the art of building, as well as of the oral and written descriptions of their intricate and wonderful system.

In the absence, then, of a style of architecture free from all possible objections, we can only adopt that which appears on the whole to offer the greatest advantages with the least objectionable qualities, and which is most capable of adapting itself to our altered circumstances. But this adaptation can only be effected by a careful study of the examples remaining from past ages. As the true artist goes to Nature, not for models but for lessons, so must we take our instructions from the remains of antiquity. From them we must extract the genius and inner principle of life of this glorious style, and on it as a foundation build in accordance with our own wants and circumstances. As Lord Lindsey has beautifully said (in reference to the study of the old masters of painting), “planting ourselves as acorns in the ground those oaks are rooted in, and growing up to their level.”† Working in this spirit, there can be no reason why we may not give birth to a new species of this great genus, bearing the impress of, and handing down to posterity, the character and genius of our time. If such *new style*, so much desired by some, is at all possible, the road to it must lie in the direction of that *old one*, the inner principle of which is acknowledged by all to be the most perfect.

In conclusion, then, on all the grounds above stated,—for its reality, its truthfulness, its origin, its associations, its sublimity

* Hope's Essay on Architecture, ch. xliv.

† History of Christian Art, Vol. III. p. 419.

or its lowliness, its magnificence or its simplicity, its capability of infinite modification,—there is no style of ecclesiastical architecture which can compare with the Pointed or Gothic for the use of the Christian church. And if we believe that the Unitarian system is a faithful embodiment of the spirit of that church, then the architecture which best accords with the spirit of Christianity must be pronounced to be at the same time “best adapted to the requirements, and most consonant with the spirit, of the Unitarian church.”

JOHN DALTON.*

IT is one of the levelling tendencies of this railway age to render less marked the characteristic differences between men, in regard to outward manifestation at least, and hence also, to some extent, in regard to mental qualities themselves. The facility and frequency of communication and the rapid diffusion of intelligence are doing much to make Londoners of us all, to remove the provincial peculiarities of manner and mind which prevailed when men dwelt in more secluded circles. The aspect of our social state is losing much of the picturesque variety by which it was formerly diversified. It is becoming more and more rare to meet with what are called “characters,”—self-formed men of quaint, grotesque simplicity and originality, presenting a *piquant* contrast to the technical correctness and uniform propriety of men trained in every respect *comme il faut*. Hence biographies of such men possess a peculiar value, as preserving some memorials of a social characteristic that the onward sweep of civilization and intelligence is effacing from us for ever.

Such a man was the celebrated John Dalton. He was eminently an *original*. Born in the bracing air of the Cumberland hills, accustomed from his earliest childhood to simple and hardy habits of life, called upon from the first to rely on his own powers, he led a strictly independent career of investigation and discovery, and attained a widely-extended and brilliant reputation as a profound philosopher, singularly contrasting with the Etruscan simplicity of his personal wants and the unvarying routine of his daily pursuits. We have somewhere seen it asserted that natural philosophers, as a class, live longer than metaphysicians and theologians, owing to the calm, healthful, regular and unexciting, though deeply interesting, studies of

* Memoirs of the Life and Scientific Researches of John Dalton, D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S., &c. &c. By William Charles Henry, M.D., F.R.S., &c. &c. 8vo. Pp. 249. London—printed for the Cavendish Society. 1854.

the former, as contrasted with the anxious, perplexing and feverish worry to which the investigations of the latter are liable. Without attempting to test the general truth of the remark, we may cite Dalton as a case in point. Both mind and body were utterly free from the slightest morbid tinge. The healthful breezes of his native hills seemed to follow his spirit through life. He lived almost without illness, preserving his faculties nearly unimpaired till the age of 70, and died peacefully and without pain as he was approaching the close of his 78th year. No man ever manifested less interest in metaphysical and theological disquisitions. The quiet atmosphere of the Friends' meeting-house which he regularly attended, was strictly symbolic of the undemonstrative and unquestioning calmness of his simple faith. His was not even a poetical temperament. Though he had a fondness for mountain scenery which imparted a picturesque character to his meteorological investigations, he could not have applied to his own youth the lines of Wordsworth (which he probably never read),—

“The sounding cataract
 Haunted me like a passion: the tall rock,
 The mountain, and the deep and gloomy wood,
 Their colours and their forms, were there to me
 An appetite; a feeling and a love,
 That had no need of a remoter charm,
 By thought supplied, nor any interest
 Unborrowed from the eye.”

The volume now under our notice, drawn up by Dr. Henry at the request of the Cavendish Society and printed for them, is the first memoir of Dalton that has appeared in print, with the exception of brief notices in periodical and other works, particularly a most eloquent, lucid and instructive article by Dr. G. Wilson in the first volume of the *British Quarterly Review*. The author in his Preface explains the long delay as having arisen from an unwillingness on the part of the late Mr. Peter Clare (Dalton's almost inseparable companion and acting executor) to give up the papers in his possession without having some share in the authorship of the memoir. Dr. Dalton's will, however, clearly pointing to Dr. W. C. Henry as his literary executor, the latter felt it to be his duty to take upon himself the undivided charge of doing honour to the memory of his friend and his father's friend; nor could the work have fallen into worthier or more appropriate hands than those of Dalton's distinguished and accomplished pupil, the son of a distinguished and accomplished friend. We may here venture to add our testimony, from our own recollection, to the cordial esteem and appreciation of the late Dr. Henry for the genius and merits of his simple and almost uncouth friend. Himself a man of highly cultivated intellect, polished manners and exquisite taste, besides being as remarkably skilful and accurate an experimenter as

Dalton was the reverse, he yet thoroughly appreciated his great and original powers, and was ever ready (as passages quoted in the present volume shew) to enforce his claims to public recognition and reward, by the chaste but earnest eloquence of his own graceful and classic pen.

John Dalton was born on the fifth of September, 1766, at the village of Eaglesfield, near Cockermouth in Cumberland. This village is said to contain the first meeting-house established by the Society of Friends in England, to which Society his grandfather attached himself. His family are known to have resided there for three previous generations. They belonged to the class of small landed proprietors, called "statesmen" in the Lake district, a class now almost extinct. Dalton was chiefly self-taught, and manifested from the first a strong tendency to mathematical calculation. When about ten years old, his curiosity was excited by a dispute among some mowers, as to whether sixty square yards and sixty yards square were the same. At first he thought they were, but after-reflection shewed him they were not. From a memorandum drawn up by himself, it appears that he attended village schools till eleven years of age, at which period he had gone through a course of mensuration, surveying, navigation, &c.; about the age of twelve, he actually began to teach the village school, and continued it two years; afterwards he was occasionally employed in husbandry for a year or more; at fifteen, he removed to Kendal as assistant in a boarding-school, in which capacity he remained three or four years; then became principal of the school for eight years. Whilst at Kendal, he employed his leisure in studying Latin, Greek, French and Mathematics, with Natural Philosophy. The school at Kendal for members of the Society of Friends was carried on by his cousin, George Bewley, with his brother, Jonathan Dalton, for an assistant, and the two brothers afterwards conducted it together. In a printed notice, a copy of which is preserved, it is promised that "youth will be carefully instructed in English, Latin, Greek and French; also writing, arithmetic, merchants' accounts, and the mathematics." The terms at first did not exceed 10*s.* 6*d.* per quarter, but were raised, in 1811, to 15*s.*, with an apologetic hope that a small advance (in consideration of the increased price of the necessaries of life) would not be thought unreasonable. The school, which contained about sixty boys and girls, was not very popular, owing to the uncouth manners of the young masters, and the stern severity of the elder brother. John Dalton was the favourite teacher, partly from his gentler disposition, and partly because he was so much occupied with his mathematical studies that the children's faults escaped his notice. During his residence in Kendal, he was a frequent and successful contributor to the Lady's and Gentleman's Diaries, proposing and solving many of the mathematical and philosophical ques-

tions contained in them. He also formed a very valuable friendship with Mr. John Gough, a blind philosopher of remarkable attainments in mathematics, philosophy and natural history, to whom he afterwards warmly expressed his great obligations in his published works. It was he who first set the example of keeping a meteorological journal in Kendal. Dalton further manifested his grateful sense of the benefits he had derived from this friend and instructor by the calmness of his replies to the somewhat angry criticisms of Mr. Gough on his subsequent discoveries. Dalton himself commenced a meteorological journal on March 24, 1787, with the observation of a remarkable Aurora Borealis which appeared on that day, and which may probably have suggested the commencement of his journal. The phenomena connected with the Aurora Borealis occupied much of his attention in after life. At this time he carried on an extensive correspondence with Mr. Crosthwaite, the founder of the Keswick Museum, who conducted a series of meteorological observations simultaneously with himself. He also made a collection of dried plants, now preserved in that museum, and bestowed some attention to entomology, observing the changes of caterpillars, and the power of a vacuum or immersion in water to destroy or suspend vitality in snails, mites and maggots. In sending some specimens of butterflies and ichneumon flies for the museum, he observed apologetically, "They may perhaps be deemed puerile; but nothing that enjoys animal life or that vegetates, is beneath the dignity of a naturalist to examine." Early in the year 1790, he made an elaborate series of observations on his own person, with the view of ascertaining the weight lost by insensible perspiration. These observations formed the subject of a paper, forty years afterwards, in the *Memoirs of the Manchester Society*, and also of a communication to the British Association. At this time he appears to have had thoughts of entering the medical profession,—a project, however, which his friends strongly discountenanced. He twice delivered at Kendal (1787 and 1791) a course of twelve lectures on Natural Philosophy, the terms of admission being the first time 10s., and the second time 5s., the course. From this time it became part of his regular occupations, and an important source of his slender income, to deliver lectures at Manchester and elsewhere.

In the spring of 1793, he was invited by Dr. Barnes, of Manchester (on the recommendation of Mr. Gough), to be Tutor in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy to the College founded by the English Presbyterian Dissenters. The terms were, that he should receive three guineas from each student in his class, with the guarantee that the sum should not fall short of £80 per session of ten months. Commons and rooms in the College were allotted him at £27. 10s. per session. He held this appointment for six years (at the end of which time the College was

removed to York), but resided in Manchester for the remainder of his life. It is always difficult to pronounce how far the career of a man of genius is really determined by external circumstances; but certainly, to human judgment, it appears that Dalton's appointment at Manchester College was an important turning-point in his philosophical career. It was soon after his removal to Manchester that he published his first work, his "Meteorological Observations and Essays," the materials of which he had accumulated during his long residence in the mountainous region of the Lakes. In 1794, he became a member of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society, of which he filled in succession all its offices of honour, until, in 1817, he was elected President, which he continued to be till his death, when he was succeeded by the late Dr. Holme, himself a native of Kendal. The Society permitted him to occupy one of the lower rooms of their building as a study and laboratory. In this room the larger portion of his subsequent life was spent, in private tuition and in the prosecution of his researches. In return for this liberality on the part of the Society, he published in their Memoirs the long series of important papers in which his successive discoveries were first made known.

In 1801, he published a work on quite a different subject, namely, his Elements of English Grammar, in which he acknowledges his obligations to Horne Tooke. This reminds us that we think we remember hearing that English composition was included in the instruction given by him in Manchester College, and that his lessons in that department were very valuable, as he never would permit any unmeaning or superfluous words. He was indeed an invaluable instructor, in any exact science, to careless, indolent or superficial minds. No smattering, showy half-knowledge would go down with him. He never would allow anything to be taken for granted. Every problem must be worked out, and the reason of every rule thoroughly understood; so that though the pupil's progress might at first seem slow, it was sure; the lessons were securely built on a solid foundation of clear intelligence, and whatever was learned with him could not easily be forgotten. The severe and rigorous simplicity of his lessons afforded a striking contrast to the florid and wordy declamations with which the late Dr. Chalmers is recorded to have embellished his mathematical lectures.

His biographer remarks, that "there occur numerous indications, in his letters and journals of this period, that Dalton, unlike Cavendish, but like most men of higher sensibility and intelligence, greatly enjoyed the society of women of superior talents and mental culture." Interesting extracts are appended in proof, together with some really very respectable "Stanzas to an Eolian Lyre," the subject of which, however, might possibly have special interest for him as an *atmospheric* phenomenon. It

is added, that "though not endowed with lively sensibilities, nor with taste for art or poetry, he was deeply moved by simple melodies, and would sit absorbed and spell-bound by certain favourite airs." In his journal for 1795, he has stated that, with another Friend, he "drew up a petition to the yearly meeting, soliciting permission to use music under certain limitations."

In the winter of 1803-4, he had the honour of being invited to lecture before the Royal Institution in London, where he was received with great kindness by Mr. (afterwards Sir H.) Davy, and listened to with much attention by his scientific hearers. He never became a popular lecturer, however, not having any graces of manner or style, and not being ready or successful in his experimental illustrations. Towards the close of the year 1805, he took up his abode as an inmate with his friend the Rev. W. Johns and his family, in George Street, nearly opposite his laboratory.

"Miss Johns has thus recorded the characteristic simplicity with which this engagement was formed:—"As my mother was standing at her parlour window one evening towards dusk, she saw Mr. Dalton passing on the other side of the street, and on her opening the window, he crossed over and greeted her. 'Mr. Dalton,' said she, 'how is it that you so seldom come to see us?' 'Why, I don't know,' he replied; 'but I have a mind to come and live with you.' My mother thought at first that he was in jest, but finding that he really meant what he said, she asked him to call again the next day, after she should have consulted my father. Accordingly, he came and took possession of the only bedroom at liberty, which he continued to occupy for nearly thirty years. And here I may mention, to the honour of both, that throughout that long connection, he and my father never on any occasion exchanged one angry word, and never ceased to feel for each other those sentiments of friendly interest which, on the decline into years of both, ripened into still warmer feelings of respect and affection.'"

Thenceforward, so long as health and strength endured, he led a life remarkably uniform in tranquil devotion to scientific pursuits, seldom varied except by a weekly half-holiday in the country and an annual summer excursion. Every Thursday afternoon it was his habit for many years to spend with a party of friends in a game at bowls at Throstle Nest, near Manchester, and it is said to have been extremely amusing to watch his eagerness when he had delivered the bowl, running after it across the green, stooping down as if talking to it, and waving his hands from one side to the other as he wished the bias to be. His summer vacation he almost invariably spent in rambling over the hills in the Lake district, in company with philosophical friends, being a hardy and active pedestrian, and combining the pursuit of health and enjoyment with meteorological observations, in

which indeed a great part of his enjoyment consisted; generally carrying with him a portable barometer to measure the heights of the mountains, and a bottle to be filled with air for subsequent analysis. In this manner he paid many visits to the summit of Helvellyn, in some of the recesses of which on the eastern side he knew where to find snow in the height of summer. A pleasant account of these mountain rambles is given by his friend Mr. Jonathan Ottley, of Keswick, who was his companion in many of them. He mentions an accidental meeting in July, 1824, between Dalton and Professor Sedgwick at Wythburn, which was mutually gratifying, and was afterwards alluded to by the Professor in his eloquent address at the Cambridge meeting of the British Association.

Early in 1818, Mr. Dalton was invited by Sir H. Davy, on the part of the Royal Society, to join the expedition to the Polar Regions under Sir John Ross, which, however, he respectfully declined. In 1816, he was elected a corresponding member of the French Academy of Sciences, on the subject of chemistry, an honour which had previously been conferred on no other Englishman, with the exception of Dr. Wollaston. It was not till March, 1822, that he was received into the Royal Society; but he seems to have been deterred from being proposed as a candidate earlier, by the amount of the admission fee and composition. In the summer of 1822, he visited Paris, together with two friends, where he was received with a distinction to which he had up to that time known nothing comparable in his own country, and had much pleasure in making the personal acquaintance of such men as Berthollet, Biot, Cuvier, Laplace, Brègvet, &c., all of whom paid him the greatest attention. He was not deterred by the habits of his sect from visiting the Italian Opera and the Théâtre Français. He was much interested in observing the solemnities of the Roman Catholic worship, and much impressed by the gallery of the Louvre. In 1826, the Royal Society awarded to him one of the two royal prizes of fifty guineas for his discoveries in chemical science, which was announced in appropriate terms by the President, Sir H. Davy, in his anniversary discourse. In 1830, the French Academy of Sciences raised him from the class of Corresponding Member to the rank of one of its eight Foreign Associates,—the highest station it has to bestow, and universally regarded as the crowning distinction in European science. He thus became one of a list of illustrious men, commencing with Newton, Leibnitz and Peter the Great, and his immediate predecessor was Sir H. Davy. Mr. Dalton was present at the first meeting of the British Association at York in 1831, and attended the annual meetings as long as his health permitted. It was on occasion of the second meeting at Oxford in 1832, that the honorary degree of D.C.L. was conferred upon him, at the instigation, we believe, of Dr.

Daubeny, and at the same time with Faraday, Mr. Robt. Brown and Sir David Brewster. Here came into play that remarkable peculiarity of vision by which he was able to distinguish only two out of the three primary colours, and could see no difference between scarlet and green or drab. Professor Sedgwick informs his biographer—"Some one, I forget who, quizzed him about his scarlet covering, while we were before Magdalen College. 'You call it scarlet,' said Dalton; 'to me its colour is that of nature—the colour of those green leaves,' pointing to the trees."* Although a member of the Society of Friends, he was thus able without difficulty to acquiesce in some of the vanities of the world, and literally to "be to their faults a little blind." This peculiarity of vision has been named, by the continental philosophers, *Daltonism*; but Dr. George Wilson very reasonably objects to the principle of thus immortalizing great men in connection with their personal defects. On this principle, he says, "the possession of a stutter would be called Demosthenism; that of a crooked spine, Esopism; the lack of an arm, Nelsonism, and so on." "Professor Whewell sought to better the matter by naming those affected with Dalton's peculiarity of vision, *Idiopts*; but to this name it was justly objected, by Sir David Brewster, that the important consonant *p* would be very apt to be omitted in hasty pronunciation, and so the last state of the *Idiopt* would be worse than the first."† The name "Colour-blindness," proposed by Sir D. Brewster, seems unobjectionable. Dalton himself, who made his peculiarity of the vision a subject of investigation, conceived it to be owing to a blue colour in his vitreous humour; but after his death, when, in pursuance of his own request, the eye was carefully examined by his medical attendant, Mr. Ransome, no peculiarity whatever could be discovered, shewing that the deficiency must have been owing to some peculiar condition of the brain or sensorium. He states that Mr. Bally, the phrenologist, was present at the examination, and "pointed out a remarkable prominence on the frontal portion of the orbital plates (which represents the phrenological site of the '*organ of colour*'), and the deficient development of the anterior lobes, which rested upon it. Of course Mr. Bally adopted this as the true explanation of the peculiarity of Dalton's vision."‡

In the summer of 1833, Lord Grey's Government conferred upon Dr. Dalton an annual pension of £150, which was shortly afterwards doubled. At this time, the popular feeling against all pensions whatever was so strong as to make this a matter of some difficulty; but it was effected principally through the earnest efforts of Mr. G. W. Wood and Mr. Babbage, aided by an eloquent and beautiful memorial from the zealous pen of the late Dr. Henry. The pension was announced in appropriate

* P. 172.

† Brit. Quart. Rev. Vol. I. p. 194.

‡ Pp. 201, 202.

terms and with characteristic eloquence by Professor Sedgwick, the President, at the Cambridge meeting of the British Association. About this time a subscription was raised by friends in Manchester for a statue, by Chantrey, in his honour; and in May, 1834, Dr. Dalton sat to the sculptor accordingly, who gave his services on very liberal terms. The following characteristic account is given by Dalton himself of his interview with Chantrey, in a letter to Mr. Peter Clare:

"May 2, 1834.—Next morning Mrs. Wood walked through the park with me to Mr. Chantrey's, when we found him in expectation of seeing me. He took a profile as large as life by a camera lucida, and then sketched a front view of the face on paper. We took a walk through his rooms, and saw busts and statues without end. He then gave me the next day for a holiday, and told me I should see my head moulded in clay on Wednesday morning, at which time he invited me to breakfast. I went accordingly, and found, as he said, a head, apparently perfect. He said he had not yet touched it, the head having been formed from his drawings by some of his assistants. He set to work to model and polish a little, whilst I was mostly engaged in reading the newspaper or conversing with him. On looking right and left, he found my ears were not alike, and the modeller had made them alike, so that he immediately cut off the left ear of the bust, and made a new one more resembling the original. Most of the time I was amusing myself with viewing the pictures and statues in the room. At last he took a pitcher and blew a little water in my face (I mean the model), and covered my head with a wet cloth, and we parted, he having desired me to bring Dr. Henry and Dr. Philp with me next morning to breakfast. We went accordingly, and found an abundant table; soon after, Dr. Faraday came in, and we all went into the working room for a time. This morning (sixth day), Mrs. Wood was kind enough to walk with me again to Mr. Chantrey's, and we spent another hour or two under his directions. At intervals we have a little amusement and instruction about our respective arts and sciences, and how we acquired our knowledge, &c., in which we vie with each other, and keep up a lively conversation."

"An engraving from Chantrey's bust is prefixed as a frontispiece to this volume. From this bust Sir Francis Chantrey afterwards modelled the statue of Dalton, of the size of life, now preserved in the entrance-hall of the Manchester Royal Institution, and one of the most impressive and intellectual portrait statues by that great artist. A more refined and ideal expression has been bestowed upon the countenance in the statue. The bust is the more faithful portraiture of the philosopher."*

"It was on the occasion of this stay in London that he was first formally admitted as Fellow of the Royal Society," and also presented at Court, through the instrumentality of Mr. Babbage, where he appeared in the scarlet gown of an Oxford Doctor of Civil Law. Mr. Babbage has furnished an amusing account of the ceremony of presentation, and of the preliminary rehearsals to make Dr. Dalton perfect in his part. The King asked him

* Pp. 184, 185.

several questions, which, Mr. Babbage says, excited some jealousy, for he heard one officer say to another, "Who the d——l is that fellow whom the King keeps talking to so long?" We think we remember hearing that one of the questions asked by the King (William IV.) was, whether the people at Manchester were pretty quiet just then. In the autumn of the same year (1834), on occasion of the meeting of the British Association at Edinburgh, the degree of LL.D. was conferred upon him by the unanimous vote of the Senate of the University.

In December, 1834, Dr. Dalton's brother Jonathan died, leaving him his property. Both brothers died of paralysis, and both survived the first seizure some years. Dr. Dalton was present at the meetings of the British Association in 1835 at Dublin, and in 1836 at Bristol, officiating on both occasions as Vice-president of the Chemical section. He did not communicate any paper to either meeting, but we remember him at Bristol giving a summary criticism of a paper on the Aurora Borealis which had been read, and which he unceremoniously pronounced to be utterly inadequate to account for the phenomena.

On the 18th of April, 1837, he had his first attack of paralysis, followed by a second and slighter seizure three days afterwards; but he had sufficiently recovered in June of the same year to be able to send to the Royal Society his memoir (composed, however, before his illness), entitled, "Sequel to an Essay on the Constitution of the Atmosphere," published in the Philosophical Transactions for 1837. He was unable to be present at the meeting of the British Association in Liverpool in Sept., 1837, for the first time since its formation. His absence was gracefully alluded to by the President, the Earl of Burlington. Through a friend, however, he communicated a short paper on the Non-decomposition of Carbonic Acid by Plants.

In the year 1840, he communicated to the Royal Society an essay on the Phosphates and Arseniates, the main purport of which was to re-assert some of his old ideas. Dr. Henry pronounces this paper to be throughout obscure and in parts scarcely intelligible, obviously the product of a mind weakened by disease; and says that the Council of the Royal Society, in declining to publish it, were unquestionably governed by a true regard to Dalton's reputation. He himself, however, was much mortified by their decision, and having procured a copy of his essay from the archives of the Society, printed it in a separate form, with the indignant comment, "Cavendish, Davy, Wollaston and Gilbert are no more." This sadly reminds us of the Archbishop in *Gil Blas*. He published, however, some short essays, containing a discovery of considerable importance as to the combination of certain anhydrous salts with water without increase of volume, shewing that the salt enters into the pores of the water. This discovery he applied successfully to the analysis of sugar, which

adds to the bulk of the water dissolving it only that of the water previously combined with it. His view has been subsequently confirmed to a great extent by the elaborate researches of Dr. Lyon Playfair and Mr. Joule.

In June, 1842, the British Association met at Manchester, where Dr. Dalton's impaired articulation and infirm health alone prevented him from filling the office of President, which must otherwise by universal consent have devolved upon him. Lord Francis Egerton (now the Earl of Ellesmere), who occupied the chair, gracefully recognized Dr. Dalton's claim to the distinction. He attended the meeting, however, as one of the Vice-presidents. This was the last memorable event in his intellectual life. He continued for two years longer to spend some hours daily in his laboratory, complaining, however, in his letters, that his memory was gone altogether and his faculties impaired, that it took him three or four times the usual time to perform chemical experiments, and that he was long in calculating. There is, perhaps, nothing in life—no, nor in death—more melancholy than the decline of noble faculties in extreme old age; it conveys so strongly to the imagination the impression that the powerful and accomplished mind which we have revered and loved, is losing its vitality for ever! On the 17th of May, 1844, he had a third paralytic stroke, from which, however, he recovered sufficiently to be present in the following July at a meeting of the Council of the Literary and Philosophical Society, where he received an engrossed copy in vellum of a complimentary resolution passed at the annual meeting, in acknowledgment of his meteorological observations for the previous fifty years. He received it sitting, and handed to his old and attached friend, Mr. Peter Clare, a brief written reply. This was on the 19th of the month. On the 27th, he was no more; his malady returned, and rapidly proved fatal.

With questionable taste (considering the simplicity of his life and character), though, doubtless, with the best intentions, the coffin containing his remains was laid in state in the Manchester Town Hall, where it was visited by upwards of forty thousand spectators. A public funeral was resolved on, and the procession consisted of nearly a hundred carriages, with many hundred persons on foot, the funeral train being about three-quarters of a mile in length.

To perpetuate his memory in the town, in addition to the statue by Chantrey in the Royal Institution, a handsome new street, opened out some years ago through an unsightly district, was named John Dalton Street, and upwards of £5000 has been raised by subscription, out of which it is proposed to erect a bronze statue in the grounds of the Royal Infirmary, and to found two scholarships in Chemistry and two in Mathematics, each of the annual value of £25, together with an annual prize for Natural History, all in connection with Owen's College. It

may be mentioned that in his will he had bequeathed £2000 "to found, endow or support a Professorship of Chemistry at Oxford;" but in a codicil "he revoked this bequest, in order to provide more largely for the family of his friend the Rev. W. Johns, who had sustained in his old age a heavy pecuniary loss."*

"Dr. Dalton possessed that healthful muscular organization of mind and of body which characterizes the natives of our northern counties, and which has, at all times, commanded for them far more than an average proportion of the higher mathematical honours in the University of Cambridge. * * * Dr. Dalton's moral excellences, from his living unmarried and much alone, had a limited field for their manifestation. He enjoyed that equable, healthful tone of nerve, of pulse, and of digestion, of which, whether as cause or effect, a serene temper is the usual exponent. He did not possess a lively sensibility; and his outward bearing, even towards his intimate friends, was calm and undemonstrative. But his attachment, when once deliberately bestowed, on the solid ground of esteem for tried worth, or of the common pursuit of the same objects in science, was never weakened or alienated. His friendships were earnest, steadfast and unalterable; and, if need came, were evidenced by acts of thoughtful generosity. * * * His moderate desires, as regards fortune, may be compared with those of the most self-denying of ancient philosophers; and were the more deserving of praise, as he passed the larger portion of his life among a community eagerly engaged in the pursuit of wealth. Many anecdotes have been preserved of the almost ridiculous moderation of his charges for performing chemical analyses. These, which were often merely a few shillings, never, I believe, exceeded a sovereign. He was in the habit of giving his invaluable instruction, in mathematics and chemistry, at the trifling charge of 2s. 6d. per hour, or, if two or more students attended together, at 1s. 6d. each for the hour."†

It was one of Dr. Dalton's personal peculiarities that he was unable to learn to swim, which he attributed to the fact that the specific gravity of his body was greater than that of water. He generally enjoyed robust health, but was very sensitive to the presence of lead in water from leaden cisterns, and to the effect of metals generally on his system. Mr. Ransome relates that on one occasion when he was suffering from catarrh, his father prescribed a small dose of James's powder to be taken at bedtime, and, finding him much better on the following morning, attributed the improvement to the medicine; upon which Dalton remarked, "I do not well see how that can be, as I kept the powder until I could have an opportunity of analyzing it."

Dr. Dalton's forehead and the upper part of his face bore a strong resemblance to the engraved portrait of Sir Isaac Newton;

* In perusing the Memoir, we have been struck with the sweeping inroads which death has already made among the friends of Dalton who survived him. Of all who are mentioned in the volume as having known him familiarly in life, there are scarcely any who have not followed him to the land of forgetfulness.

† Pp. 205—207.

and the members of the British Association present at Cambridge in 1833, were impressed with his likeness to Roubillac's statue of Newton in Trinity College chapel. In his manners and general bearing, though not in the slightest degree vulgar or offensive, he was simple and plain-spoken. It was amusing sometimes to witness the discouraging reception which he gave, though unintentionally, when President of the Literary and Philosophical Society, to any paper of a purely literary character, remarking, perhaps, in his harsh, gruff tones, that the Society were much obliged to the gentleman for his communication, which was, no doubt, extremely interesting—to those who took an interest in such subjects. On one occasion, he was returning with a party of Manchester friends from a visit to the late Mr. Greg, of Quarry Bank (who was distinguished by his dignified courtesy), and remarked, with the utmost naïveté, that Mr. Greg was quite different from most of the manufacturers—he was quite a gentleman! We remember once meeting him at a social party at the house of Mr. Johns, where he lived, and being struck with the fact that the object of our youthful reverence was familiarly addressed by Miss Johns (when we were going down to supper) with the request, “Will you bring the candles, Mr. Dalton?” He had the unassuming simplicity and freedom from affectation natural and becoming to a man of true power, which stands forth in unconscious majesty, all the more impressive to an appreciating eye, from the absence of pretension or display. He was wholly unobtrusive in regard to his religious and political opinions, and unobtrusive in regard to his social duties, but would sometimes give largely in proportion to his means to any benevolent object that he deliberately approved, and was always ready to perform acts of unostentatious kindness. Dr. G. Wilson relates a striking example of his strict regard to truth. A student, who had missed one lecture of a course, applied to him for a certificate of full attendance. Dalton at first declined to give it; but, after thinking a little, replied, “If thou wilt come to-morrow, I will go over the lecture thou hast missed.”

We have thought it best not to interrupt the above sketch of the life and personal character of Dr. Dalton, by any digressive attempts to characterize the nature and value of his scientific labours, which we would now make the subject of a few remarks.

We have heard Dr. Dalton quoted as an example of a man who attained to the first rank in the prosecution of a science, viz., chemistry, to which he did not begin to devote himself till he was forty years of age. Professor James Forbes, in his Report on Meteorology, has been still more wide of the mark, on the other side, in speaking of Dalton as one of those who have occasionally stepped aside from their systematic studies, to bestow some permanent mark of their casual notice of a subject they had never intended to prosecute. “Mr. Dalton,” he says, “de-

scends for a moment from his chemistry in the abstract, to illustrate the constitution of the atmosphere and the theory of vapour." Dr. Henry has clearly shewn that Dalton's course was, in fact, precisely the reverse. He began by being a meteorologist, and became a great chemist in consequence of his meteorological researches. So far from exhibiting any abrupt or arbitrary transition from one branch of investigation to another, he was distinguished through life by the unity and persistency of his researches. He used to attribute his own success to patient perseverance; and certainly, without his power of steady abstraction and untiring energy, the genius displayed in his bold and skilful generalizations would have accomplished comparatively little. It was the uniform effort of his mind to introduce mathematical certainty and precision to his scientific investigations, and it was thus that he produced his great revolution in the science of chemistry.

It has already been mentioned that one of the earliest subjects of his investigation was the Aurora Borealis, which continued to attract much of his attention. He was one of the first clearly to establish its magnetic character; but in the immense elevation which he ascribed to it (about 150 miles), judging by the simultaneous observations of distant observers, he too hastily assumed that it was the same arch which was visible to both. It is now agreed that, in the words of Humboldt, "every observer sees his own aurora as well as his own rainbow."

Dalton's earliest communication to the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society was on the subject of his own peculiar vision, to which we have already sufficiently alluded. After an interval of nearly five years (March, 1799), he read a paper on the quantity of rain and dew as compared with the quantity of water carried off by rivers and raised by evaporation, with an inquiry into the origin of springs. The most valuable part of this essay was a note containing his theory of aqueous vapour as an elastic fluid independent of the atmosphere. This essay was followed by one on the power of the fluids to conduct heat, in reply to Count Rumford, the most interesting part of which was a preliminary inquiry into the maximum density of water, eliciting the discovery that the expansion of water at any number of degrees *below* that of the point of greatest density, was equal to that at the same number of degrees *above*. The same volume of Transactions contains a beautiful memoir on the heat and cold produced by the mechanical condensation and rarefaction of air. The *suddenness* of the effect on the thermometer led Dalton sagaciously to infer that the real amount of the change in temperature was much greater than appeared, which he demonstrated by some most skilfully-devised yet simple experiments. This memoir was a favourite production with its author, and he caused the condensing-pump made use of to be introduced into the

back-ground of his portrait by Allen, together with a paper of atomic symbols.

His next contribution to the Manchester Memoirs (read in October, 1801) is pronounced by his biographer to be by far the most original and important of his experimental works. It was entitled, "Experimental Essays on the Constitution of Mixed Gases; on the Force of Steam or Vapour from Water and other Liquids in different Temperatures, both in a Torricellian Vacuum and in Air; on Evaporation; and on the Expansion of the Gases by Heat." In the first of these four essays, he propounded the remarkable hypothesis that in mixed gases the particles of one gas have no power to attract or repel those of a different gas, and consequently that each gas is equably diffused through the whole of their combined volume, without reference to their different specific gravities. Hence he explained the uniformity in the composition of the atmosphere at all elevations. His hypothesis, however, has not obtained entire and universal assent. The second essay was of great importance in calculating the absolute quantity of moisture in a given volume of air, and opens with an anticipation of a subsequent discovery by Professor Faraday, that all elastic fluids may be reducible to liquids at low temperatures and by strong pressures. From a few experiments, he boldly deduced the law, "that the variation of the force of vapour from all liquids is the same for the same variation of temperature, reckoning from vapour of any given force," which has proved to be generally correct. In the fourth essay, he deduced from experiments that all elastic fluids, under the same pressure, expand equally by heat, and that, for any given expansion of mercury, the corresponding expansion of air is proportionally something less, the higher the temperature. "It seems, therefore, that general laws respecting the absolute quantity and the nature of heat, are more likely to be derived from elastic fluids than from other substances. As every other liquid expands more in the higher than in the lower temperatures, the probability is that mercury does the same." These conclusions, says Dr. Henry, may be affirmed to lie at the basis of the profound and unrivalled memoir, by MM. Dulong and Petit, on the measure of temperature. Their exact experiments with an air-thermometer have confirmed Dalton's sagacious inferences.

On Nov. 12, 1802, he read before the Manchester Society an "Experimental Inquiry into the Proportion of the several Gases or Elastic Fluids constituting the Atmosphere," which is of peculiar interest as being his earliest contribution to pure chemistry, and as announcing, in the combinations of oxygen and nitrous gas, the first example of the law of *multiple proportions*.

In a memoir read Oct. 21, 1803, "On the Absorption of Gases by Water and other Liquids," he affirmed that water, freed from air and agitated in any gas not chemically combining with it,

would absorb either its own bulk, or $\frac{1}{8}$, $\frac{1}{27}$, $\frac{1}{64}$, $\frac{1}{125}$, &c., that is, the cubes of the reciprocals of the natural numbers 1, 2, 3, &c., viz., $\frac{1}{1^3}$, $\frac{1}{2^3}$, $\frac{1}{3^3}$, $\frac{1}{4^3}$, $\frac{1}{5^3}$, &c., the same gas always being absorbed in the same proportion. He stated also that the quantity absorbed is *as* the density or pressure; and that the density of the gas *in* the water has a special relation to that *out* of the water, the distance of the particles within being always some multiple of that without. He drew the conclusions, amongst others, that the gases are mechanically mixed, not chemically combined; and that they retain their elasticity amongst their own particles just the same in the water as out of it, the water intervening having no other effect than a mere vacuum. His theory, however, has not been rigidly verified by subsequent experiments. The concluding paragraph of his essay significantly suggests, as an explanation of the different bulks of the several gases absorbed, a difference in the weight and number of the ultimate particles composing them, and appends a table of what he computed to be the relative weights of the ultimate particles of gaseous and other bodies, taking that of hydrogen as 1.

In May, 1808, he published the first part of his *New System of Chemical Philosophy*, a work which, in matters of detail, is now superseded and obsolete, but ought always to be remembered as an example of profound and original investigation.

In reference to Dalton's atomic theory, it must be admitted, in regard to the question of priority, that the German chemists, Wenzel and Richter, had discovered that bodies combine with each other in definite and constant proportions, and had perceived the practical importance of the discovery, though their labours attracted little attention at the time. Their views were opposed by the genius and eloquence of Berthollet, and at length confirmed by the skilful analyses of Proust in 1808. Still, however, they were far from being recognized as abstract and universal truths in the distinct and bright light in which Dalton revealed them. Mr. Wm. Higgins of Oxford, in 1791, in a work on the *Phlogistic Controversy*, struck out, as a sagacious and happy conception, something approaching to the atomic hypothesis. It was not, however, the fruit of a sustained induction, and he was guided by no fixed and uniform principle in the atomic constitution assigned by him to compound bodies. His views, therefore, attracted little notice and were soon forgotten. At all events, it is clearly proved that Dalton knew nothing of his views. It was not his habit, indeed, to read much, and he was always prone to self-reliance, rather than to take upon trust the conclusions of others. As Dr. Henry has well said, "It was by persistent efforts of thought, by direct interrogation of Nature herself, and not by the study of books, that he achieved his great discoveries." Dr. Thomson testifies that when he visited Dalton in August, 1804, he learnt from him that the atomic theory first occurred to him

during his investigations of olefiant gas and carburetted hydrogen gas, the latter being found to contain exactly twice as much hydrogen as the former, which determined him to consider olefiant gas as a compound of 1 atom of carbon and 1 of hydrogen; and carburetted hydrogen, of 1 of carbon and 2 of hydrogen. The idea thus conceived was applied to carbonic oxide, water, ammonia, &c., and numbers representing the atomic weights of oxygen, azote, &c., deduced from the best analytical experiments which chemistry then possessed. This testimony is confirmed by the statement of Dalton himself in the first volume of his *New System*. Almost all chemists concur in attributing to Dalton, without reservation, the fame of discovering this law of *multiple proportions*. Dr. Henry considers it as proved that the atomic theory arose in his mind from the study of matter in its aëriform condition; but he also testifies from his own notes, when a pupil of Dalton, that his meditations were materially influenced by Richter's law of *reciprocal proportions* or equivalents. The law of *multiple proportions* was exclusively his own. The atomic theory, it may be observed, though conveying to the mind a distinct and beautiful conception of the laws of chemical combination, as well as a sublime idea of the infinite minuteness of creative order, is only a probable *hypothesis*, so far as it implies that bodies are composed of equal and indivisible particles; and it has not been accepted universally as more than an hypothesis. It is not capable, probably, of absolute demonstration. Dr. Thomson, of Glasgow, was the first chemist who boldly and cordially recognized its vast importance, and brought it prominently before the Royal Society in January, 1808. Dr. Wollaston followed at the next meeting in a remarkable memoir on superacid and subacid salts. The atomic philosophy was peculiarly accordant with the mathematical exactness of his mind. Sir H. Davy, whose ardent and soaring genius was widely different from that of Dalton, for a long time held aloof. In 1809, the year succeeding the publication of the *New System*, Gay Lussac's important memoir on the law of combination of the gases by *volume* in equal or multiple proportions, was really a striking confirmation of the atomic theory, though Dalton, adhering with characteristic tenacity to the principle of estimation by *weight*, was at first, if not always, unwilling to adopt it. No European chemist has done so much to confirm the atomic theory by exact experiment as Berzelius. Dr. Henry's volume contains an interesting letter to Dalton from that illustrious Swedish chemist, in which he says, "You are right in this, that the theory of multiple proportions is a mystery without the atomic hypothesis."

One of the most striking confirmations of the atomic hypothesis since it was enunciated by its author, is the law of Isomorphism, by Mitscherlich; the law, namely, "that the same number of atoms, combined in the same way, produce the same crystalline

form; and crystalline form is independent of the chemical nature of the atoms, and determined only by their number and relative position." "A chemical compound may be compared to a building of definite form, in the erection of which the shape and size of the stones, not their quality, are to be regarded."

Dr. Faraday, again, has done much to illustrate atomic determinations by his great discoveries in electro-chemistry, establishing the identity of electrical and chemical action, and proving that the amount of electricity necessary for the decomposition of any elementary substance, is equivalent to its atomic weight.

The class of what are called *isomeric* bodies, i. e. bodies strikingly dissimilar, yet consisting of the same elements in the same proportions, are also deemed inexplicable on any other than the atomic hypothesis.

Dr. Wollaston argued in favour of the atomic hypothesis, that, if matter were infinitely divisible, there could be no limit to the earth's atmosphere, "which must pervade all space and be condensed around the different planetary bodies in degrees dependent on their respective attractions," contrary to astronomical observation. This argument has been objected to by Dr. Whewell on mathematical grounds, but it is in accordance with the views of Laplace and Sir Isaac Newton.

There is, again, a remarkable resemblance and regularity in the relations discovered to exist between the atomic weights of certain bodies characterized by similar chemical properties and generally associated together in nature, seeming to point to the probability of the speculative doctrine that there really exists only one primitive matter, into which the 62 bodies, now deemed simple elements, may be ultimately resolved.

Dr. Dalton attempted, and with some success, to compute the relative magnitudes or diameters of atoms, as well as their weights, an investigation which has latterly been prosecuted with much ardour both in this country and in Germany; and the relations established between the atomic volumes of bodies are such as strikingly to confirm Dalton's great hypothesis.

Lastly, the new study of organic chemistry has largely confirmed the atomic theory—first, by the universal adoption of its language—secondly, by the law of substitution of one simple element for another, in regular order, in large classes of organic products—thirdly, by the doctrine of chemical types, founded on the above laws—fourthly, by the law of Homologues, or the symmetrical relations between the atomic formulæ of large classes of analogous organic substances. Dr. Henry appeals to Dr. Hofmann's masterly lectures on organic chemistry, recently delivered in the laboratory of the Royal Institution, as "emphatically atomic in the entire scope and spirit of their teaching,"—indeed, in the lecturer's own words to the author, "conceived, to a certain extent, in Dalton's spirit;" and they were illustrated by

elaborate and beautifully contrived atomic symbols and diagrams, which would have delighted Dalton himself.

Dr. Henry's volume contains two interesting letters from Dr. Faraday and Baron Liebig to the author, both attesting the immense practical value of the atomic theory; though, with regard to the strictly *atomic* hypothesis, as implying a solid nucleus, Dr. Faraday rather favours the old metaphysical conception of the constitution of matter (shared also with Boscovich, Priestley and Hutton) as consisting of mere powers of attraction and repulsion, without any extended particles as a substratum.

In November, 1810, appeared the second part of the *New System of Chemical Philosophy*, which is remarkable as exhibiting the fluctuations of opinion in the author's mind, and the chaotic condition of the science out of which he was labouring to educe order and light. It also exhibits the persistency with which he resisted the conclusive experiments of Davy in relation to potassium, sodium and chlorine, and Gay-Lussac's beautiful demonstration of the law of volumes. It proves that Dalton did not rank high as an *experimental* chemist. As Dr. Henry well remarks, "Nature, it would seem, with a wise frugality, averse to concentrating all intellectual excellences in one mind, had destined Dalton exclusively for the lofty rank of a *lawgiver* of chemical science." The same remark is applicable to the second volume of the *New System*, the first part of which appeared in August, 1827. "Dalton can never be regarded as an authority in the details of chemistry." The most interesting portion is the Appendix, in which the author modifies some of his earlier views, assenting, for example, though not unreservedly, to the doctrine that potassium and sodium are simple metals, but still withholding entire concurrence with the then universally received doctrine of the combination of gases in equal or multiple volumes.

It was the habit of Dalton's mind, from a few hints afforded by observation, to meditate a sagacious theory, which he then proceeded to test by experiment. Though an inaccurate, he was never a random experimenter. His experiments were always devised, and often most skilfully so, with reference to a preconceived hypothesis, of which he made the true and legitimate use as a help towards the systematic arrangement and comprehensive significance of a number of scattered facts. This tendency of his mind was exhibited no less strikingly in his failures than in his triumphs. From Dr. Henry's concluding survey of the nature of Dalton's investigations, and of the character of his mind, we must restrict ourselves to the following sentences.

"Without venturing to compare him with one who has had no equal or compeer in the highest science, it may yet be affirmed that his intellectual habitudes were near of kin to those attributed to Newton. Both these great philosophers were characterized by the faculty of steady,

prolonged, unswerving attention, wholly abstracted from external objects and events—of patient, concentrated thought. It was Dalton's wont, as in boyhood so in mature life, to struggle with the problem he had to solve, silently and intensely in the depths of persistent meditation. He was ever accustomed to maintain that greatness in any pursuit is mainly reached by indomitable perseverance. * * * Like all original, self-reliant minds, he was never solicitous to consult books or to learn the opinions of others. * * * His extreme reluctance to increase the small scientific library belonging to the Literary and Philosophical Society, and the only one in Manchester, by the purchase of even such important works as the *Mécanique Céleste*, or of any books except the periodical journals, and his preference of all other modes of expending the surplus income, * * * must be fresh in the remembrance of many members of that Society. * * * Dalton's habits of association and reasoning were slow and somewhat laborious, even when he was merely perusing the deductions of other mathematicians. * * * There was nothing fitful or impulsive in his nature; no sudden gleams of inspiration. He was ever calm, thoughtful, passionless. Imagination had absolutely no part in his discoveries; except, perhaps, as enabling him to gaze, in mental vision, upon ultimate atoms of matter, and as shaping forth those pictorial representations of unseen things, by which his earliest as well as his latest philosophical speculations were illustrated.”*

The Appendix contains a valuable essay by Dr. G. Wilson on Colour-blindness, a lithographed specimen of Dalton's handwriting, and tables of chemical symbols used by him.

In closing our notice of the work under review, we must remark, that where so much is excellent, it has been difficult to compress our materials within the necessary limits of an article; and we hope that the memoir will ere long be accessible as a whole to the public at large, as well as to the members of the Cavendish Society, to whom, however, we feel greatly indebted.

We must now take leave of the volume before us, bearing our hearty testimony that, so far as we are competent to pronounce judgment upon its merits, it is in all respects worthy of its subject;—a respectful and affectionate tribute to the personal character, as well as an elaborate and masterly memorial of the philosophical achievements, of the simple-minded John Dalton.

J. R.

CHRISTENING IN RUSSIA.

THE form of christening in Russia differs materially from that of our Church. The priest takes the child, which is quite naked, and, holding it by the head, so that his thumb and finger stop the orifices of the ears, he dips it thrice into the water; he cuts off a small portion of the hair, which he twists up with a little wax from the tapers and throws into the font; then, anointing the baby's breast, hands and feet with the holy oil, and making the sign of the cross with the same on the forehead, he concludes by a prayer and benediction.—*The Englishwoman in Russia*.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE REV. WILLIAM GASKEILL, M.A.,
TO THE STUDENTS OF THE UNITARIAN HOME MISSIONARY
BOARD, IN CROSS-STREET CHAPEL, MANCHESTER, DEC. 4, 1854.

MY younger brethren, who desire to fit yourselves for the responsible office of Christian Missionaries: In the address to which you have just listened,* the spirit which should actuate you and the essential qualifications for your work, have been so fully set forth, that there remains little or nothing to be added on these points. There are, however, a few things which I may say on the relation that general culture, and more particularly those branches of it which are committed to my charge, bear to the duties you will have to fulfil.

Your sphere of labour, it is intended should lie mainly among the poor and less instructed; but it may be that you will oftentimes need help from the richer and better-educated, in order to carry out your plans of usefulness. And you must see at a glance how important it is that, when you have to solicit their aid and co-operation, they should not be tempted in any way to despise you—to regard you as those having zeal without knowledge—but should find in you, not only men who are earnest in a good cause, but men who by their wisdom and thoughtfulness, their whole tone and manner of address, can recommend and adorn it, and so win attention and secure confidence.

It was once an idea, and with some is perhaps still, that all which could be required for the discharge of an office like yours among the poor, was a thoroughly devout and religious spirit. And no doubt (as you have just been told) this is the first and indispensable requisite. If you have not such a spirit yourselves, you cannot impart it to others. It must be experimentally felt by you, before you can hope to make any one else feel it. But as I am fully persuaded, that the teacher of a young child will be the better fitted for his task by the widest range and the greatest accuracy of knowledge, if he only understand how to use them aright, so, both observation and experience tend to convince me, will it likewise be the case with those who devote themselves to the instruction and elevation of the humbler classes. In cultivating this important field, it cannot prove otherwise than advantageous to have been furnished with the best implements, and made familiar with the best processes, if there be only the proper spirit to direct and apply them. The noblest intellect may here find work to task its powers; the richest mind objects on which to expend its wealth; and the highest refinement, braced up and strengthened by Christian principle, a sphere in which to make its soft, delicate influence felt.

To come a little closer to the particular subjects which enter

* From Dr. Beard, the Principal of the Institution.

into my department: Some of you may be disposed to ask, what are the peculiar benefits which you may hope to receive from the study of the English language and literature, the history of the world and the men who have inhabited it, the nature of the human mind and the laws which govern it? It may be said with a show of truth—poor and superficial enough, but bearing the semblance of sound argument—“What is the need of delicacy and fastidiousness in the use of language? The matter is more than the manner; the thought than the diction. And as for general literature, how is a knowledge of that to bear upon the pure and simple Christianity which earnest-minded men are to teach to those probably far less cultivated than themselves? And in regard to history, the present is the time they have to study, and how to read the riddles of to-day, instead of poring over the mistakes or slow advancement of past ages, in which all the circumstances of life were so dissimilar to what they are now.” In a spirit like this, may some have questioned the wisdom of the course of instruction which has been drawn out for you. Let me offer to you my reasons, or rather one or two of them, why it seems to me wise to include these branches of learning.

Let us, first, take the study of the English language, and consider a little what that means—what it comprehends—in what light we must view it so as to elevate it into an occupation worthy a student for the Christian ministry—how we must regard it before we can affiliate it to the service of the Most High. Language is God’s gift, marking our capability of social relation. It started from the point of naming things palpable to the senses; next must have arisen a want of expression for the feelings and emotions; and lastly, as man’s nature developed itself, thoughts and ideas would seek and find some mode of utterance. Thus, as humanity grew richer, language increased and strengthened; and now we regard that as a poor tongue, spoken by an ignorant and uncultivated people, in which the words are few, and what there are relate to material objects of sense rather than subjects of thought and reflection, or to (higher still) great spiritual truths. There is, for instance, a tribe in New Zealand who have no word for God; without knowing anything more about them, we may feel almost sure they live the life of the beasts that perish. As a man’s conceptions increase and extend, so too his need for full and correct expression of those conceptions grows and enlarges. To take a single illustration: the child, and he whose eye is untrained, call all the various shades of a particular colour “red;” but he who receives only a vague, general idea from the use of this word, wants to have the precise shade specified by one of the terms “pink,” “rose,” “scarlet,” “crimson,” or whatever else it may be. And so he who examines into the infinitely divisible character of abstract things,

requires the exact word, before he can satisfy himself that he has expressed the true meaning that is in him. He will not be satisfied to make "envious," for instance, stand in place of "jealous;" he will perceive and define the difference between these two feelings, and be aware that he is wronging truth by employing the one instead of the other. I have given an example (not the best perhaps that might be found, but that which occurred to me most readily) where poverty in the choice of words compels a speaker to a slight deviation from what is true. This poverty may arise from many causes. Oftentimes it is from sloth. We do not care to define our meaning precisely to ourselves, and when it is defined we do not take pains to search for the exact word that would fit it; consequently, our thought thus loosely clothed does not impress itself distinctly and vividly on the minds of others. But your duty will be, to impress the souls of those with whom you have to do as deeply as you can with the truth and importance of the solemn message which you are to bear from God to men. You must not, you will not spare to realize its true force to yourselves; you must not spare any more to speak it out in clear, sharp, fitting words—each so appropriate that no other would do as well. Those are the kind of sentences that bite—that cannot be forgotten; so full of pith and meaning that they cling without effort to the memory, and rise up as great warnings or great encouragements in the silence and solemnity of night. It is not a multitude of words that convince and move listeners; nor is it what is commonly called fine language. No! it is the truth and force with which they convey the speaker's meaning that gives them worth and power. And in order that your words may have this spell of truth with which to command attention, it is needful that you should study their nature, and learn their derivation, and analyze their meaning. The simplest terms that drop from our lips have some tale, which we must compel them to unfold before we can thoroughly comprehend their just value, so as to be sure that we employ them rightly. The creation of numberless words in daily use, has arisen from some working of God in the heart of man, which has necessitated a new term to evolve its full meaning. So, if we look upon language as one of the great capacities which He by whom we are so "fearfully and wonderfully made" has bestowed upon us, we shall be ashamed to use it poorly, or lazily, or falsely, for want of care or study on our part; and feel that for His sake and to do His work, we must strive to make it, in our use, of a noble richness and impressive power, as well as of a choice simplicity and a faithful accuracy. And this, I trust, will be one of the ends that you will steadily and perseveringly aim at; and in the attainment of which I shall do my utmost to assist you, by familiarizing you, as far as I can, with the true force and spirit of words, and accustoming you to employ them with freedom and

readiness, both in written composition and extemporaneous address.

I have so far spoken only of the bricks that compose the building—the language that forms the literature; and I have said, that the study of words—their exact meaning, their derivation, and their present use—is necessary to enable a man to utter forth his thoughts and convictions to others with much chance of deeply influencing and affecting them. I have next to try and give you some idea of the importance which I attach to English literature as an element in this course of training. Language and literature have a reflex influence the one on the other; and in order to use a language perfectly, we must be well acquainted with its literature. But besides this, a knowledge of even the lighter kinds of it is most desirable to one who intends to work in Christ's ministry. When I speak of the lighter kinds, I especially and expressly mean the best of those kinds; the highest and noblest works of belles lettres; the grandest poems and the finest dramas. These benefit a man, as I conceive, in this way. Every teacher, and every minister, has to do with others whose education and character are different from his own, and whose processes of mind are not seldom difficult of comprehension to him. The farther they are removed into the darkness of ignorance and sin, the more unintelligible do they frequently become, and the more apt is he to look upon them as a sort of monsters. A good deal of this has arisen from the way in which some sects and some ministers have considered it a duty to keep pulpit teachers from all free contact with the natural sun and air of human life. They were not to do this, or were to be on their guard against that, as something *unclerical*; conversation was checked, and a different character assumed, so long as the minister was by; and as he often entered upon his work and this hothouse mode of existence while yet very young, he literally did not know the force of the temptations to which other men were exposed in the daily course of their lives, and in consequence his exhortations and admonitions too commonly flew altogether wide of their wants. But public opinion is righting itself in this matter. It is getting to understand, that a knowledge of what is in man, even to the lowest depths of his capability for crime, is quite compatible with the utmost purity, with strivings after the most severe and lofty standard, with a pity for the slaves of sin so self-sacrificing as to be truly Christ-like. This holy use of the knowledge which is pain, is far above any poor, petty, monkish ignorance of the real state of the world, and communicates far higher power, when rightly improved, for healing its sore places and remedying its sicknesses and woes. And, side by side with great crimes, are great virtues; closely neighbouring vice, are many touches of angelic quality. As the first of all poets has told us, "there is a soul of goodness in

things evil." Yes! the poet it is who has had the deep prophetic insight into human nature, that may teach the wisest student of mere matter-of-fact a deeper wisdom still. And therefore is it that the great dramas (which can only be great by being true to the core of humanity); and the noble poems, which penetrate to the very heart of God's creation and discover its wondrous secrets; and the grandest fictions, which grow out of the form of fiction into true revelations of human nature—its shortcomings, its weaknesses, its errors, its crimes—its struggles, its endurance, its self-sacrifice, its faith, its bravery, its heroism—which make us enter into phases of life and action, and into a common feeling with men, such as we shall perhaps never be likely to encounter;—I say, such dramas, poems, fictions, calling out great flashes of feeling, as we read, which reveal the secret beauty of many dark, hidden places, are well worthy of careful study, because well worthy of true appreciation. We can none of us have the perfect knowledge of what is in man, which made our blessed Master so pitiful and kind; but we can enlarge our views of what men are, and have been, and shall be, by submitting to be taught, in this spirit, by the great works of former days. Independently of effects of this kind which the study of them is fitted to produce in yourselves, they will richly supply you with illustrations, and images, and forms of expression, which may prove of essential service in helping you to awaken the minds and impress the hearts of others. Poetry has been justly called by Richter "the friend and helpmate of religion;" and through its means you may, in some cases, gain access, that would otherwise have been denied, to those secret feelings of wonder and awe, without which there can be no such thing as faith. One of my pleasantest, and I am persuaded not the least profitable of my duties will be, in accordance with these views, to lead you through the rich and varied fields of our country's literature, and give you what aid I can towards enabling you to contemplate it with a discriminating eye and appreciating spirit, and to induce you to store your memories with its grander strains, and nobler passages of sacred song.

By such a magnificent seer have historic dramas been written, that his marvellous insight has almost presented a truer truth, in imaginative guise, than all the chronicles from which he drew the basis of his story. Yet the chronicles of those days—simple, credulous, prejudiced, party-sided—were a better history to study than that of more recent times—the times of Hume, Gibbon and Voltaire. In some of those older records there was a constant, though it might be a superstitious, reference to the hand of God; in the later ones there was a subtle atheism of spirit, none the less mischievous because unavowed. It needed, not a mere scholar, or a patient and learned critic, to restore History to its proper position among the branches of learning to be taught to Chris-

tians;—it needed a godly, righteous man. Such a one was granted; and since the time of Dr. Arnold, the great story of the past dwellers on earth, their slow and gradual advancement in real civilization, has taken its place as a record of the truth, that there is a God who judgeth among the nations, and that, however kings and despots may strive, or the heathen rage and imagine vain things, He alone is King of kings and Lord of lords. It is a solemn light in which we sit, while unfolding the rolls of history! Slow it may be, but sure and inexorable it must be, that following of a nation's punishment upon a nation's crime—that doom upon actions considered wise and prudent in their day because expedient and profitable, found out in the course of time to be a mere sowing of the wind to reap the whirlwind—and the nation, which sought by such means to deliver itself, thrown back into a worse perplexity still. Yet, marking by centuries rather than by generations, we at the same time catch cheering hope and encouragement, seeing how, amidst all lost arts, all dark ages, all wild irruptions of savage barbarians, sweeping out civilization as with a besom of destruction, the sound of God's mighty trumpet is never lost, as it calls to the vanguard of the people of the earth, and bids them strive upward and onward into the glory of His kingdom. In going over with you the history of the world, and tracing civilization from its first faint beginnings to its present condition, my object will be, not to encumber your memories with a multitude of dates, needful only to the scholar, nor rest satisfied with viewing great events in their mere outward aspects, but to lead you, as far as I am able, to look for their hidden connections and dependences, and trace out their true spirit, and see how, under God's providence, those circumstances which seemed at the time most unpromising and disastrous have been made to conduce to good, and how, amidst all the manifold vicissitudes, fluctuations and delays to which our species has been subject, the hand of a beneficent Ruler is still bearing it onward to a higher and nobler position, and affording greater reason for "one generation to praise His works to another."

Some have questioned the desirableness of occupying your time, as is proposed, with the study of the Greek Testament; and if the intention were to aim at imparting to you anything like a thoroughly critical knowledge of it, I should more than share their doubts. But I am convinced it will require only a moderate degree of attention, through the three years over which the course extends, to give you such an acquaintance with it as will not only enable you to understand and weigh the force of such references as are made to it for the purposes of controversy, but, still more, to read it with that ease and fluency which will bring you to feel and enjoy the charm which an original always possesses over a translation; and thus perhaps be the means, in some cases, of giving a freshness to passages which have lost

something of their power and beauty through early and long-familiar use. I might speak of the advantages to be derived from such a study in regard to the knowledge of our own tongue, and the exercise which is afforded to the mind in the process of acquiring a grammar so different in many points from our own; but I am content to rest on the last consideration I have mentioned, and to support it by the opinion of one whose judgment carries the greatest weight with me, and, I have no doubt, will with you. "A very slight comparison," says Mr. Kenrick, "of our common version of the New Testament with the original, will suffice to shew how often our translators have rendered by the same term words which in the original have a discriminative meaning. This has been in part owing to the comparative poverty of our language, but in greater degree to the want of careful discrimination by the translators themselves. The more minute accuracy of modern philology will enable the reader of the original to appreciate differences which they passed unnoticed; but it will ever be impossible to a translator to express many of the distinctions which exist in the original, as between *ἱερόν* and *ναός*, *ἀληθής* and *ἀληθινός*, *ἀγαπάω* and *φιλέω*, *ζωή* and *βίος*. There will always remain, therefore, a vast advantage on the side of those who, by reading the New Testament in the original, are able to perceive the full import of the language of the sacred writers." And that advantage I see no reason whatever why you should not enjoy.

Many of the class to which it is designed that you should more specially direct your ministrations, are now beginning to think, and think earnestly, not only on the great social problems which relate to their own condition, and on those points of theology which have hitherto mainly engaged the attention of sects, but upon the grounds of all religious faith whatever. And, as you can hardly fail to be aware, in the course of their thinking many questions arise that will require you to have your intellects sharpened, and trained to the use of those processes of right reasoning, which will enable you to go straight to the heart of those specious sophistries by which they are frequently led astray, and meet their doubts, and solve their difficulties, and command their respect. With this view, therefore, my friend and colleague will, when the proper time comes, engage you in the study of the qualities, laws and relations of the human mind with special reference to the Secularistic doctrines and tendencies. Of the importance of such study to fit you for becoming effective missionaries to a considerable portion (and in many cases by no means the worst) of the labouring classes, none who are acquainted with the present state and direction of thought amongst them can, I imagine, entertain a moment's doubt; and it is unnecessary for me, therefore, to enlarge upon it.

Our object in this, and every other branch of instruction, will

be, to give them as directly practical a bearing as we can on the great purpose which we have in view; and to make the knowledge which we communicate, though it may not be very wide in its range, at least not indistinct and superficial, but as far as it goes, thorough, complete and accurate. How far we shall succeed in this object, depends very much, of course, on the readiness with which you meet our efforts, and the temper in which you work together with us. From the motives which lead you to seek our aid, if sincere, as we believe them to be, we can feel little misgiving on this point.

Whatever the study that engages us, let it, above everything, be entered upon with a reverent spirit. In none will it be out of place; in none without its service. As holy George Herbert says,

“Who sweeps a room, as in His sight,*
Makes that and th’ action fine.”

If you do aught “as in His sight,” you do it thoroughly. No half-performance but becomes a mockery of God. You may have only one talent, but you dare not bury it. You must make the most of every grain and tittle. Half-work may pass in the eyes of men; superficial study may impose upon men; but if you take up your task as appointed by Him, you cannot imagine so vain a thing as deceiving the Searcher of hearts! For myself, if I had to choose between two pupils, I should have more hope of a conscientious dunce than of an irreligious wit. The one would know his little thoroughly; the other might have a considerable amount of shallow knowledge or purposeless learning, but the breath of life—the soul which would give vitality in giving usefulness—would be wanting; the acquirements gained to dazzle men, would have no foundation wherewith to serve God. The full meaning would not have been sounded. The work would be but half-done.

I would only further say, Strive to realize continually more and more what a noble mission it is for which you are to prepare yourselves. Earth has, can have, none that is nobler. To preach the gospel to the poor—to be the means of lifting their life out of the low, deep gulf of sensualism in which its finer qualities are all frequently sunk and lost—to set freshly flowing in their hearts those fountains of pure and holy feeling, which have been well nigh choked and dried up through long neglect—to call forth and minister to those higher hopes and aspirations of their souls, which have been wholly absorbed in thoughts and cares for the material and perishing—to fill them with the happy strength which trust in the great Father’s love inspires—to pour the cheering light of an immortal world over their oftentimes clouded path

* Quoting from memory, “as in His sight” was substituted in place of “as for Thy laws.”

through this, and to irradiate before them the dreary darkness of the grave—to do this for them as brethren of the same family, God's children, for whom He never ceases to care—must surely approve itself to every Christian as a work the most sacred and blessed to which man can devote himself. With this feeling may you enter upon it! The fields are everywhere white unto harvest. May you prove worthy labourers in it; and the blessing of God, who giveth the increase, rest upon you! And when the Lord of the harvest comes, may the sheaves that you have bound, and gathered in, be many; and you yourselves appear before him rejoicing!

SOME ADVANTAGES IN BEING A SMALL DENOMINATION.

THE smallness of the body is perhaps no great evil. All depends upon the end you have in view. If you regard your denomination as a tree on which all the birds of the air are to sit, or as a net which is to catch all the fish of the sea, then of course its smallness is a bad thing. But if it is the leaven which is to leaven the mass, then there might be too much of it as well as too little. As soon as a denomination grows large, it grows conservative—it has to consider its denominational interests. Wealth produces timidity always. Wordsworth says truly that riches are akin

“To fear, to change, to cowardice and death;”

and this is true of all sorts of riches. A denomination possessing a great many churches and a great many communicants must necessarily be timid as regards innovation. Such a denomination can never be the pioneer corps of the advancing army, or the forlorn hope in the attack on error. Now we are certainly in no immediate danger of such an *embarras des richesses*; but if our 250 churches were all active and strong, and were scattered more equally through the country, they would perhaps be numerous enough for our work. A denomination, therefore, may sometimes be conveniently small as well as a political party. It is with the size of the denominations in the church as with the number of individuals in a denomination. If some benign power should permit us to choose the multiple with which to multiply each of our leaders, we might wish to multiply such men as the late Dr. Parker, of Portsmouth, or the late Henry Ware, Jun., by a hundred, and such a man as the late Bernard Whitman by ten. But Dr. Channing we would not wish to multiply at all, nor Andrews Norton, for one of each is enough for a denomination. So 200 Unitarian churches are perhaps as good for the church at large as 2000.—*Rev. J. F. Clarke's Address at the Ministers' Conference.*

CORRESPONDENCE.

MISS MARTINEAU AND THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

[This, and the letter which follows it, did not reach the Editor's hands in time for insertion in the last No.—Ed. of C. R.]

MISS H. MARTINEAU presents her compliments to the Editor of the *Christian Reformer*, and requests permission to correct an error which she understands has found its way into the *Reformer*. Miss H. M. has not seen the work, but she is informed that she is there stated to be concerned in the editorship of the *Westminster Review*; whereas Miss H. M. has never had, and is not likely ever to have, any concern whatever in the editorship, or in the management of any kind, of the *Westminster Review*.

The Knoll, Ambleside, Nov. 12.

[We willingly make known Miss Martineau's disclaimer of the editorship of the *Westminster Review* ascribed to her by a very current rumour. If our readers turn to the critical notice (*C. R.*, Vol. X. p. 699), they will see that Miss Martineau, however distinctly alluded to, is not named; and that, not the editorship, but the "proprietaryship," of the *Review* is ascribed to her. The statement was qualified by the clause, "if report be correct." Such a statement was calculated (and this we hinted at the time) to benefit rather than injure the *Westminster Review*.]

MR. PANTON HAM AND HIS REVIEWER.

SIR,

WILL you allow me a brief space just to say, in reply to your notice of a small work of mine, that that book and its sequel were published four or five years ago, and prior to the pursuit of those inquiries, the avowal of whose results has now for between two and three years earned for me the repute of being a Unitarian. In so far as the book in question advocates the doctrine of Immortality the Gift of God, and not the constitutional possession of our race, it expresses my "*present* opinions." The mode of advocacy, in some respects, as well as some statements made in the concluding lecture on the subject of Future Retribution, I consider indefensible, although I am not prepared to avow that the *theory* of that lecture is contrary either to Christian doctrine or sound reasoning.

But when you state that you have received information "that Mr. Ham has referred to this work as a fair representation of his *present* opinions," and proceed to indicate the theories of inspiration and atonement developed or implied in the book as examples of my "*present* opinions," I have only to say that you have been incorrectly informed; as, for some time past, I have regarded the indiscriminate use of Scripture in the book as a radical defect, implying a false theory of the relative worth of the several documents constituting the Bible; and no publication of mine expresses any approximation to my "*present* opinions" on the Atonement previous to a series of articles in the *Christian Examiner*, and certain letters and tracts which were published in Bristol on the

occasion of a long-continued controversy with some of my ministerial brethren there on that question.

Whatever I have published has been prepared under the disadvantages of incessant and often most excitable controversies for a period of more than five years, and during the transitional state of my mind in that period. I look back, therefore, on much which I have both said and written with considerable distrust, and should be very unwilling to be brought to the bar of any book or tract of mine, and, in every particular, judged thereby.

I am thankful that my mind has not been stationary since the publication of "Life and Death," and that I have been privileged to reach conclusions which I find recognized in the Christianity of the Unitarian churches, and which I trust those churches will ever faithfully defend and vigorously disseminate for the health and even vitality of the Christianity of our age.

J. PANTON HAM.

NEW VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

SIR,

WE have heard very little lately of the design of publishing a new version of the Old Testament. The recent Reports of the Unitarian Association do not allude to it. It is to be hoped, however, that it is borne in mind. We may wait too long. The difficulty of satisfying ourselves in the matter may postpone it *sine dié*, as the actual impossibility of individual attempts towards it have repeatedly done already. Rather, therefore, than entertain so hopeless a prospect, would it not be better to bring together and publish what separate translations of the Old Testament books we have, in the shape and under the name of the OLD TESTAMENT in a new and more correct Translation? There are materials for it. We might long ago have put together the parts translated by Mr. Wellbeloved, Geddes, Lowth, Newcome, Blayney, and perhaps one or two others. They would make up the whole. Objections might be made, no doubt, to each, from one quarter or another; and more recent knowledge might be wished for by some. Still I believe a first effort of this kind—an effort towards a new shape of the Old Testament—could not be better made. We want some initiative or transition movement from things as they are, if only to disabuse vast numbers of a scripture-ignorant public of their childishness and absurdities. The proposed versions also, coming from such opposite quarters of the religious world, would have a most beneficial effect upon prejudice, bigotry, and every imaginable ignorance;—would be the pioneer to other exertions;—perhaps shame inactive religion, learning and wealth, in many churches, to labours more worthy of their Christian calling. It is a distinguished honour to our own body, that two of its laymen have given two new versions of the New Testament to the world very recently, in addition to the former one from our divines. Surely we may, from existing sources among ourselves and other churches, place the Old Testament before the world in a shape to reassure the public, that as a translation it may appear in a new, a more correct, and, on their own showing, a more inspired form.

Nov. 15, 1854.

J. H. RYLAND.

INTELLIGENCE.

UNITARIAN HOME MISSIONARY BOARD.

This institution having now assumed a fixed and definite form, and commenced its active operations, it may not be undesirable to place on record in the pages of the *Christian Reformer*, a sketch of the proceedings which have marked its origin, and of the condition in which it at present stands.

The project commenced with a prospectus privately circulated at the close of 1853, which was followed by the formation of a Committee, consisting of the gentlemen in and near Manchester who shewed the most active interest in the scheme, and the result was a meeting of Unitarian ministers and laymen, in Manchester, May 31, 1854, when the new institution was formally established, its fundamental laws determined on, and a Committee of management appointed. From that time to the present, the plan has been prominently before the Unitarian public.

The object of the Unitarian Home Missionary Board is to prepare young men for missionary labour in connection with Unitarian congregations or institutions. Its characteristics are the advanced age at which it receives its pupils, the simple and practical courses of instruction to which it limits them, and especially the union, through the whole course of study, of practical effort among the poor with mental exercises. It is thus attempted to bring forward men of experience as labourers in the cause of truth and religion, with a certain amount of knowledge and at the same time with popular habits and powers. The efforts of the Committee have hitherto met with a most encouraging and hearty response. The list of officers includes some of the most influential men amongst us; the number of candidates for admission as students has been larger than was anticipated, and the character of those candidates has been, as a whole, very satisfactory; the subscriptions have nearly reached £800, the amount of expenditure estimated for the first year; and upwards of £500 in donations will meet all extra expenses incident on the commencement of the plan, as well as future contingencies.

The Committee having appointed the Rev. J. R. Beard, D.D., and Rev. W. Gaskell, M.A., the Tutors, and having

elected ten students, opened the first term on Monday, Dec. 4. The students are from different parts of the kingdom,—two from Cheshire, two from Lancashire, two from Yorkshire, one from Warwickshire, and three from the South. They assembled for the purpose of being informed as to the hours of instruction, &c., in the earlier part of the day, and in the evening they met the Tutors and Committee in Cross-Street chapel, when the public were also invited to attend. A very numerous assembly shewed the interest felt in the occasion. Among those present were, besides the gentlemen who took an active part in the proceedings, Revds. J. H. Hutton, T. E. Poynting, C. Beard, J. P. Ham, G. H. Wells, J. Colston, C. W. Robberds, A. Lunn, J. Layhe, J. Wright, F. Bishop, W. Whitelegge, J. Heywood, Esq., M.P., Wm. Rayner Wood, Esq., E. Bowman, Esq., T. Wrigley, Esq., J. Shawcross, Esq., T. Ashton, Esq., &c.

After the singing of a hymn, Rev. S. Bache, one of the Vice-Presidents, read a passage of Scripture, from Luke x., and offered a very appropriate prayer. Dr. Beard then delivered an address to those present, in which he insisted on the necessity of missionary effort in every Christian organization; he then spoke more directly to the students themselves, and pointed out how essential it is that every one of them should have a spirit of living piety, and should devote himself to his work; he further mentioned the importance of a power of utterance to their success, and concluded with an allusion to the Unitarian character of the institution, and a powerful appeal to the pupils to assist, by their diligence and good conduct, the effort that is being made.—Rev. W. Gaskell then addressed the students on the importance of the literary part of their studies. In a most interesting address, the peculiar beauty of which is unfortunately lost in any abstract of it that can be given, he shewed the assistance given to a minister,—even a minister who labours among the poorest and least educated,—by an acquaintance with the “English language and literature,” with the outlines of history, and the laws that govern the human mind; he likewise defended the wisdom of enabling the students to read the

Greek Testament, quoting on this subject some very appropriate sentences from Rev. J. Kenrick.

After another hymn, the proceedings terminated with a prayer and benediction from the Rev. G. Harris.

It is needless to say that the addresses were listened to with great attention; on the men who are just commencing their new career as students they seemed calculated to have a very powerful effect. The next morning the classes commenced, being held in the libraries of the Tutors. The Committee hope without delay to appoint the Superintendent Missionary, who will initiate the students in their practical duties. All applications, however, with regard to their Sunday occupations (in preaching or Sunday-school teaching) may be made to the Principal, Rev. Dr. Beard.

Under such favourable auspices has this new institution entered on its career. May the high expectations of its supporters be fulfilled by its success, and by the usefulness of those whom it may send out into the world!

OPENING OF THE HUDDERSFIELD UNITARIAN CHURCH.

This interesting event took place on Thursday, Dec. 21, and, notwithstanding the unpropitiousness of the shortest day of the year for a gathering of friends from a somewhat wide geographical circle, the attendance was highly respectable and satisfactory. Our readers will remember that the corner-stone of the church was laid, Oct. 3, 1853, by Mr. Mark Philips, whose excellent address on that occasion we had the pleasure of recording in Vol. IX. p. 717. In that article we gave a correct architectural description of the intended building, to which we would now refer our readers. The style of the building is the Perpendicular Gothic, which is almost peculiar to English ecclesiastical buildings, and very appropriate, from its simplicity and its capability of giving at a moderate outlay a fine architectural effect to churches and chapels of moderate dimensions. The external appearance of the building, especially as beheld from the west and south, is very pleasing. The perfect proportions of the several parts gratify the spectator's sense of beauty, and in a far higher degree than would be anticipated from the very sparing resort made by the architect to the ornaments of Gothic architecture. We expect in a future

No. of the Magazine to be enabled to give our readers an engraving, from a photograph, of the church. It is situated in Fitzwilliam Street, the front elevation being to the south, and the chancel to the north. We are happily enabled, by our freedom from all local superstitions, to free the architects of our houses of prayer from all embarrassment respecting the position of the chancel; to us it is matter of indifference whether our communion-tables are east or north. The church is approached from the street by steps and an ascending path, shrubs being planted on each side in the space in the front between the church and Fitzwilliam Street. On entering the church, after passing beyond a screen of Bradford crimson cloth, the spectator commands an uninterrupted view of the building. The five stone pillars which sustain the roof of the nave are light and elegant. The eye in the first instance rests on the window to the north, which is the largest in the building, the tracery of which, by the boldness and beauty of its design, gives an appearance of richness beyond what would be anticipated from the simplicity of the details. The pulpit is placed somewhat inconveniently, we think, in front of the stone pillars; this is doubtless so placed to give the preacher an equal view of the congregation in both the nave and the western aisle, but it compels the preacher, when reading the Scriptures, &c., to speak directly in front of a pillar within a few feet of the pulpit. A very slight change of position in the pulpit would remove this inconvenience, and not put the preacher out of view of the people in the aisle. The pulpit is in the best taste, and though constructed, like the benches, only of stained and varnished deal, looks better than some elaborate and costly pulpits which we have seen elsewhere. As to size and height, it is, we think, just right. The preacher commands the congregation without being placed, as it were, on a lofty watch-tower; and it is of good Protestant proportions, unlike the shabby apologies for pulpits which Puseyite architects, unable to range beyond Catholic precedents, are wont to design. It has a flood of light upon it,—a blessing which a young preacher may be indifferent to, but of which old eyes know the value. Amongst the details of the building, we noticed that the hood-mould terminations of the arches which spring from the pillars, are decorated with the heads (we be-

lieve) of Mary the mother of Christ, Christ, John, Matthew, Peter and Paul. The northern wall, behind the communion-table, is hung with a handsome kind of tapestry with the fleur-de-lis pattern, from the noted manufactory for articles of this kind of Mr. French, of Bolton. Beyond these particulars, we have little to add to the description of the building formerly given, the design having been, with one or two minor deviations of a technical nature, carried out in its integrity. It was stated in the previous notice that the building was intended to be heated by means of gas; on further investigation it was found on the whole preferable to adopt the system of hot-water pipes. The lighting of the church is effected by means of five gas pillars of brass standing on the floor, one under each of the arches dividing the nave from the aisle, and each supporting five gas brackets, enriched with brass scroll-work; there are also five brackets fixed against the east wall, each having three burners; other lights also are fixed by the entrance, in the vestry, and elsewhere. The raised platform on which the communion-table stands is intended to be laid with appropriate carpet. The situation which the organ at present occupies at the north of the west aisle, is, we believe, only temporary; and we may be allowed to express a wish that, when circumstances permit, the organ may have a new external case. The present case is neat, but wants in its details conformity to the building. It has also been suggested that an appropriate ornamental device on the front of the communion table-cover, would much improve the appearance of that end of the church.

On the whole, we may express our admiration of the building, both externally and internally. Its cost is not yet announced; but, from what we can gather, it will fall short of £3000. In a small ecclesiastical structure, it is not easy to reduce the cost per sitting much below £10. This church is designed to contain 300 sittings. The original estimates have been greatly exceeded, by the advance in wages and materials, and the necessity of substituting stone for terra cotta in the windows. The congregation is naturally disappointed in not being able to open without a debt; but those who are familiar with their history, seeing how much they have done for themselves in a very short time, and estimating the claims they have on the sympathy and help

of other churches, entertain the hope that, before many years are over, every vestige of debt will be cleared away.—As the hour appointed for the dedication service approached, the members of the congregation came in, and friends mingled with them from Liverpool, Manchester, Dukinfield, Rochdale, Lydgate, Wakefield, Bradford, Leeds, Dewsbury and Sheffield. Amongst other visitors, we observed Mr. Darnton Lupton, Mr. Joseph Lupton and Mr. Frank Lupton, of Leeds; Mr. Heap, of Rochdale; Mr. Fisher and Mr. Solly, of Sheffield; Mr. Ivie Mackie, of Manchester. The ministers present were Rev. J. K. Montgomery, the pastor of the church, Rev. James Martineau, Rev. E. Kell, Rev. E. Higginson, Rev. Thomas Hincks, Rev. Patrick Cannon, Rev. John Owen, Rev. E. Hall and Rev. R. B. Aspland. The musical arrangements for the day were very good, the chapel choir being greatly strengthened for the occasion. The clear and rich treble notes of Miss Armstrong, of Manchester, were heard to great advantage. In addition to three hymns, there was an anthem, "My soul truly waiteth upon God," &c., composed by Mr. J. Battye, of Huddersfield, and the whole concluded by the Hallelujah chorus. The organ, which is built by Lincoln, of London, is small, but very sweet. It was played on this occasion by Mr. Mellor, of Huddersfield. The freedom of the building from anything to obstruct the progress of sound (the place designed for the vestry being at present vacant), and its unceiled design open to the roof, makes it particularly favourable to vocal and instrumental music. The introductory service was conducted by Rev. J. K. Montgomery, the pastor of the church. The warm interest felt, and the indefatigable exertions made by him in procuring the funds and in watching over the progress of the building, were known to all, and his words of thanksgiving and solemn dedication were echoed by the hearts of many worshippers. After the dedication prayer, he read passages from 1 Kings viii. and John iv. Before the sermon, Mr. Martineau offered a prayer, of great devotional solemnity and beauty; and the congregation gave, in their rapt stillness, perhaps the best proof they could of their sympathy in this devotional exercise. After the anthem, Mr. Martineau's sermon followed. His text was Heb. viii. 5: "Who (the priests) serve unto the example and

shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the Mount." The sermon was a gloriously eloquent defence of religion and devotion, shewing, in opposition to the reasonings of the Atheist and the Secularist, the necessity of religion and prayer to the human heart, and illustrating the argument by the fact, that the greatest men the world has yet seen in philosophy, poetry and science, have been men of praise and prayer. The preacher, in tracing the principle that God works out his great designs by influencing his creatures to work according to a pattern, led the thoughts of his hearers to the importance of revelation, and especially to the revelation by Christ, the sinless, the risen and the immortal. We will not attempt to give an analysis of this remarkable discourse, nor will we run the risk of marring the beauty of any one of its many admirable passages, by transcribing it from our imperfect notes. There is a probability of its being offered to all who desire to read it through the press.

At the close of the sermon, a collection was made in aid of the building fund, which, with one or two additions later in the day, amounted to £57.

After the service, about seventy of the ladies and gentlemen present proceeded to the Queen's Hotel to dinner. The chair was taken and most ably filled by Mr. Darnton Lupton, of Leeds, who gave the customary loyal toasts, prefacing them with brief and singularly happy remarks. One toast, which we never before remember being given at an Unitarian meeting, was "The Army and Navy," to which Mr. Ivie Mackie spoke appropriately. The only other speaker was Rev. John Owen, of Lydgate. "At an early hour the friends separated, enjoying in groups for a short time pleasant social intercourse, which all felt to be better than formal speech-making and toasts. In the evening, there was a pleasant gathering of friends in the place in Bath Buildings, hitherto used as the chapel. The chair was taken by James Stansfeld, Esq., of Halifax, the Judge of the County Court of that district. The proceedings of the evening were diversified and relieved by sacred music, very pleasingly given by the choir. We regret that the late period of the month and our limited space forbid us from attempting

anything like a full report of the proceedings.

The CHAIRMAN in opening the business of the evening said that he thought it would have been more appropriate if upon this sacred and solemn occasion—an occasion so important to the interests of that place, and to the town in general in which they were assembled—some gentleman more closely identified with the work, the building and the society had taken the chair; but he trusted that in attempting to perform the duties assigned him, those who would have to occupy more of the time of the meeting would make up for his shortcomings. He would state, without having any communication with the parties immediately connected with the rearing of it, what he believed to be the principles upon which the church had been erected, believing that they would be sympathized with in the main, by those who would ordinarily worship therein. First, he believed, the grand principle upon which this society was established was the Protestant principle of the Bible, and the Bible only, being the religion, without any other creed or formula. Add to this the Presbyterian principle, that every one had a right to interpret the precepts and doctrines of that Bible according to his own private judgment. He believed, further, that the observation of or attachment to any particular creed was not essential to what, in common language, was called acceptance or salvation; but that in every place, amongst every body, every one who truly and earnestly strove to understand the will of his Maker and to perform it, would be accepted by Him on that great day when each one would be called on to render an account of the deeds done in this body. He himself did not pretend to limit the foundation of his convictions to any particular texts or portions of scripture; but there were two passages especially presented to his mind, one in the Old and the other in the New Testament, which bore out the view just offered—"What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" And, "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world." He thought these not merely the "Law and the Prophets," but the Gospel also. He then called upon

The Rev. EDWARD HIGGINSON, who

spoke to the first sentiment:—"Our Churches—their character, aims and agencies; and increased prosperity to the Huddersfield Congregation in their new church so auspiciously opened this day." Unitarian churches differed materially and nobly from all other churches. Were the Christian world to be classified, it would be divided into two sections: Trinitarian Protestants and Catholics would form one division—the greater number—and Unitarians the other and much smaller section. He did not say this from a love of sectarianism, but mentioned it as a matter of fact. Yet, in their comparatively small numbers, what a large amount of thought, knowledge and intellectual activity was in harmony with them! It was a great cause of rejoicing to him as a Unitarian Christian, that by reason of that merely he was in harmony with nature, science, knowledge, and all the influences of taste and general improvement. Upon all these things Unitarian faith looked not with a tolerating, but a sympathizing and trusting love. The character of their churches was essentially free. They had carried forward the great central truth of freedom of mind fearlessly as no other denomination had ever done, thereby attaining to that simple theology which was the result very commonly, but not the necessary attribute, of free thought; and it was the chief distinction in their minds, the chief blessedness of their views as Unitarians, not that they held precisely this theology, but that they held it as free-minded, free-hearted men. The aim of their churches was to fulfil the great aspiration which was the necessity of the rising advancing mind; or, more definitely, so far as they pursued a purpose, their object was like that of the gospel itself—to promote peace on earth and good-will toward men. Benevolence in every practical form was the true attribute of a Christian church, and the agency by which their church was to pursue the great purposes of piety and benevolence was not like those of some churches, fixed, determined and stereotyped. Here, again, their freedom enabled them, as soon as they had a distinct purpose—the increase of religious knowledge, the education of youth, or the pursuit of any scheme of Christian benevolence—at once to institute the necessary agency for the object. Thus good institutions had accumulated about them, and one of the most noble institutions of Christian philanthropy had its rise in their church

—domestic missions. He concluded by warmly congratulating the Huddersfield congregation upon the completion of the building so auspiciously opened that morning.

The Rev. THOMAS HINCKS seconded the sentiment. In the course of a very interesting address, in which he cogently argued for the erection of beautiful places of public worship, he observed that no body was so qualified as Unitarians to meet and destroy, by their free open spirit, the intense spirit of infidelity and of secularism spreading with such desolating effects among the working classes, and that the work of annihilating such opinions seemed peculiarly incumbent upon Unitarians.

The Rev. J. K. MONTGOMERY, in acknowledging the congratulations of his friends, said he felt himself in one of the most embarrassing positions he had ever occupied—with feelings that could scarcely find utterance, and with an enfeebled frame, and he had almost said an enfeebled mind. He should therefore have preferred to have been a silent listener, for he had spoken not to-day alone, but for months, and not in words, but by deeds. He thanked the mover and seconder of the preceding resolution, and those friends who had come to aid them in the dedication of their church. He thanked them for their sympathy, and for their expressions of regard and good wishes for their prosperity. Their success would depend upon themselves, and he had confidence in them. No one but those who were familiar with the circumstances under which they had erected their new building, could at all understand the anxieties, the labours and the cares which it had involved. Most did know them, and they had nobly met them. They had cheerfully endured them, they had patiently worked, and he hoped their reward was at hand. For his own share in them, he was more than rewarded in their approbation and admiration of the beautiful building they had raised. When that building commenced, many of them were rather in despair. He for one had never despaired, and he would never be satisfied until they were unencumbered with debt.

Rev. R. BROOK ASPLAND, being called on to move the second resolution, spoke of the proceedings of the day as a more than sufficient reward for the exertion of quitting their fire-sides on that short, dark and stormy day. He dwelt with approving words on the

building that day dedicated to God's worship, and then proceeded to characterize the sermon which it had been their privilege to hear, as one equally beautiful in its construction and true in its sentiments. While the preacher had gratified their taste by a series of beautiful images, they were used to elucidate profound thoughts. Little as some who heard it might be aware of it, it was a controversial sermon, for it grappled with some of the worst errors of the age. Yet there was not a word that could have hurt the feelings of the most sensitive hearer. It was a perfect refutation of Atheism and Secularism, and a beautiful and philosophical plea for Revelation, and was most appropriate for the occasion. It had been a great privilege to listen to such a discourse, and he had therefore great pleasure in moving, "Our best thanks to the Rev. James Martineau, for his deeply religious and beautiful discourse this morning." The resolution was seconded by Mr. Hornblower, and carried amid applause.

The CHAIRMAN said, as he and others had not the advantage of listening to the discourse, he would request Mr. Martineau to allow it to be printed.

The Rev. JAMES MARTINEAU said he scarcely knew in what terms to express his acknowledgments to one of the early friends of his college years, and to them also for the mode in which his discourse that morning had been referred to. But he would not occupy their time by attempting to detract from the undue praises which Mr. Aspland had bestowed upon that discourse, and perhaps the best way in which he could refute those praises was to consent to the request of the Chairman. It would then answer Mr. Aspland's panegyric most effectually. He was not favourable to the system of publishing sermons delivered on such occasions, but as the desire existed and had been so strongly expressed, he could not think of withholding his poor contribution to the services of that day. After explaining why he had dwelt on such general truths, and had not spoken particularly of the doctrines which peculiarly characterized the Unitarian portion of the catholic church, Mr. Martineau proceeded to express a belief, founded on his own experience, that the line of demarcation between Unitarians and other denominations of Christians was growing rapidly less sharp, and that a careful examination of modern sentiments and feelings shewed a

mutual sympathy richly and widely spreading itself through all cultivated minds. There was a great change going on in matters of religion in society at large—a change to which it became them, he thought, to adapt themselves; there was an immense and an ever-growing interval between the external professions and forms of worship and the creeds which were upon the lips of the professed leaders of sects and the actual morality and religion which mutually moved and stirred the great heart of our English society.

After an address from Mr. ENGLAND, the Treasurer of the society, a vote was passed in grateful acknowledgment of contributions to their church; and subsequently resolutions, embodying votes of thanks, were passed to Henry Bowman, Esq., of Manchester, the architect; to the Rev. J. K. Montgomery, the minister; to the Revs. Edmund Kell, R. Brook Aspland and W. H. Channing; to the ministers and friends of other congregations; to the Choir; and to the Chairman; and the proceedings terminated.

On Sunday, Dec. 24, the services were conducted by Rev. W. H. Channing in the morning and evening, and by Rev. Edmund Kell in the afternoon. On Sunday, Dec. 31, the services will be conducted by Rev. R. B. Aspland.

MINISTERS' BENEVOLENT SOCIETY.

Dear Sir,—It is gratifying to me to find the position which I took a year ago in reference to this Society, justified by the report of the managers themselves at their late anniversary, as recorded in your last number. I learn from that report, that the number of *beneficiary* subscribers is 64, and that "the annual amount which the Society would be in a condition presently to distribute, if required, would be about £400."

Now, Sir, my proposal of the year before was, that each minister becoming incapacitated (or his widow on his death), should have a positive claim (which I ventured to estimate at £8 per annum as the *minimum*); anything beyond that amount to be allowed at the discretion of the managers. I proposed this as something short, indeed, of the nobility of plan characterizing the Lancashire and Cheshire Widows' Fund, but as the best thing practicable on the basis of the very low payments already established in the Birmingham Society. To this proposal it was ob-

jected that the Society would not be able to guarantee *so much*; and also that they ought to pay *much more*, in order to be of any practical use. My purpose is now only to vindicate the financial soundness of what I then proposed. Of the 64 beneficiary subscribers, I allowed the extreme supposition of one-third becoming claimants on the fund in the course of time. One-third of 64 is 21; and 21 annuities of £8 each would amount to £168, being considerably less than one-half of the now estimated power of the Society.

Am I justified by these statements of the managers? May I not still hope that something better than a "healing compromise" may be adopted, as I have proved that our ministers in general consider the principle of a fixed claim (optional with themselves and families to assert or waive, according to their own perception of their own circumstances) to be essential to their

self-respect in becoming or remaining members of the Society? A compromise cannot be healing. The *principle* must be conceded. If others can be content to sue for a return in case of possible need, I at least am not.

EDWARD HIGGINSON.

Wakefield, Dec. 23, 1854.

UNITARIAN SOCIETIES IN THE UNITED STATES.

The number of congregational Unitarian societies in the United States, according to the Unitarian Register, is 236. In New England there are 197, and 156 of these are in Massachusetts.

Unitarian societies have been established in twenty of the States. If we include the societies of the Christians, and others whose faith is substantially Unitarian, the number would amount to some thousands.

OBITUARY.

Dec. 1, at Edgbaston, Birmingham, in the 65th year of his age, SAMUEL KENRICK, Esq., second son of the late Rev. Timothy Kenrick, of Exeter. His death was the consequence of erysipelas in the head, which proved fatal after a few days' illness, during the latter part of which only was any danger apprehended by those about him.

He was designed for the profession of a Solicitor, but the death of his father, in 1804, changed his destination. In 1805, he came to reside at West Bromwich, with his uncle, the late Mr. Archibald Kenrick, with whom he was subsequently connected in business, and still more closely by marriage with his younger daughter. By the death of his uncle, Mr. James Kenrick, of Wrexham, in 1824, he succeeded to the principal part of his property and to a share in the Bank established by him. The occupation which thus devolved upon him was less suited to his habits and turn of mind than that in which he had been brought up, and the losses which he sustained compelled him ultimately to give up the Bank into other hands. In the wreck of his own fortunes with which this change was accompanied, it was no painful sacrifice to him to renounce wealth or the station which it procured him; for neither of these had he ever greatly valued;

but the thought that others had been involved in his misfortunes was deeply painful to his upright and sensitive mind; nor did he ever entirely recover his cheerfulness after this event.

He had received a classical education, and though a busy life had left him little leisure for the extension of the knowledge early acquired, its effects were visible in his tastes, his thoughts and his language. He had great refinement of mind, a sound and discriminating judgment in literature, and an ardent love of antiquarian and philological pursuits, which proved a solace and relief to him in misfortune and sickness. His public character was well described by his friend and pastor, Mr. Bache, who in a discourse delivered at the New Meeting on the Sunday after his funeral, spoke of him as one "who through many years had witnessed a good confession, in that glorious cause of Christian Truth and Freedom, the maintenance of which had descended to him and to his family as their richest inheritance, and who was at the same time ever forward in benevolent labours for the diffusion of knowledge, the advancement of practical morality, and the promotion of the real welfare of all around him." The justice of this description would be acknowledged by all who heard it;

but the real qualities of his mind and heart were to the world in general "a hidden treasure." Reserve not only of manner, but of temper, concealed from all beyond the circle of his most intimate connections the sterling worth of his character, the purity of his motives, his deep religious feelings, and the warmth and steadiness of his domestic affections.

K.

Dec. 6, at Hulme, Manchester, aged 79, Mr. HENRY POTTER. This worthy man lived and died in humble circumstances, but was remarkable for a sound understanding, cultivated tastes and religious habits. Though brought up in orthodox sentiments, he was of English Presbyterian descent. Converted to Unitarian principles about the time that Mr. Grundy gave his celebrated lectures, he connected himself with the Dukinfield congregation, by the successive ministers and members of which he was always held in high respect. One of his nephews is Rev. William Parkinson, the Presbyterian minister of Tamworth. Mr. Potter had assiduously cultivated his mind, and on the subjects of astronomy and botany was particularly well informed. He was familiar with the Flora of every district in which he passed any time. The following letter, addressed to him by Sir J. E. Smith, in acknowledgment of a botanical communication, will be read with interest by the student of botany. Had Sir J. E. Smith known that his correspondent was simply a hand-loom weaver, it would have probably increased his interest in him.

"Norwich, Sept. 22, 1819.

"Sir,—Your obliging letter of the 20th of July, reached me this day only, having been brought by a friend from London. The androgynous specimen of *Salix* is indeed very curious, especially as I suspect the species to be by no means certain. It is my *S. aurita* B. of Flora Brit. Vol. IV., which I have always been afraid to separate from *aurita*, though my late friend Mr. Crowe was inclined to do so. At first I thought your plant might be what I have, *doubtfully*, called a downy variety of *tenuifolia*, see Fl. Brit. 1052, 1053; but yours is more downy, and the capsules have each a longer *pedicellus* than in my Kirkby Lonsdale specimens. The stamens in some of yours seem monadelphous.

"I shall certainly communicate your discovery where it cannot but be very acceptable. Mr. Gee's is mentioned in our half volume published last June.

"Be pleased, Sir, to accept my thanks for this communication, and believe me your obliged and very obedient servant,

J. E. SMITH.

"My address is, Sir James Edward Smith, P.L.S., Norwich.

"I usually pass six or eight weeks in London every spring, and am now going from home for five or six weeks."

At one period of his life, Mr. Potter went to reside with a sister, to whom he was very warmly attached, and who lived in the village of Eyam, in Derbyshire. Here, as elsewhere, he made no concealment of his firm adherence to Unitarian opinions. The circumstance of the orthodoxy of the village being (however quietly) impugned, gave serious umbrage to the Rector, now a Peer and one of the most amiable of living Bishops. The Rector remonstrated with Mr. Potter for conversing with some of the young men of the village on the doctrines of religion, not on the ground of his, but *their* want of information on the subject. The next Rector after a time used stronger means than remonstrance, and as Mr. P. was living with the village schoolmaster (the husband of his sister), the trustees of the institution, at the instigation of the Rector, gave notice that unless Mr. Potter quitted the place, the schoolmaster and mistress would be dismissed. This act of persecution was the more unjustifiable as the Unitarian had never sought to influence any of the scholars. He of course quitted the village rather than expose his friends to wrong. The union of firmness and gentleness which he exhibited under the trials of this persecution, aroused in some of the inhabitants a feeling of sympathy. They marked their feelings by a subscription, and presented him with a silver snuff-box, on which was engraved an inscription, recording that it was "presented by the friends of civil and religious liberty at Eyam to Mr. H. Potter, as a deserved token of regard and esteem for his general worth." About eighteen years ago, the writer became acquainted with the subject of this notice. He found him in a humble lodging at Mossley, occupying his enforced leisure (for little work was at that time to be had) by reading the controversy between Price and Priestley on Matter and Spirit. The intelligence with which he discoursed on the subject,—the entire absence of all repining, and the cheerful piety with which he spoke of blessings where others would have found only reasons for discontent,—made a

deep impression on the writer. That impression has been confirmed by years of subsequent intercourse. The last days of this good man were days of severe and increasing agony from an incurable internal disease. He was carried to the burial-place which surrounds the ancient chapel in which he had so long been a cheerful and most intelligent worshiper, and after a brief but earnest tribute to his intellectual and moral worth from his minister, was lowered to his last earthly resting-place amid the regrets of relatives and some old and warmly-attached friends.

Dec. 14, at Sale Moor, Cheshire, aged 80 years, Mr. PETER LEIGH, for many years a manufacturer in Ashton-under-Lyne, and a respected member of the Dukinfield congregation.

Dec. 15, aged 27 years, at his father's house, Woburn Square, London, of a disease of the heart, after an illness of many weeks, JOHN HUTTON TAYLER, Esq., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-law, M.A., LL.B., and Fellow of University College, London.

Rarely, it is believed, has so brief a career been closed amid deeper regrets, a more genuine expression of respect and affection, and brighter auguries of future success in life. Spontaneously selecting at an early age the profession to which he resolved to devote himself, the beloved and lamented subject of this short notice had passed with eminent credit and even distinction through the different stages of his academic course. In the two preliminary years spent in Manchester New College, he raised the expectations of his friends by carrying away more than his average share of prizes. He then became a student of University College, London, where he gained the Flaherty scholarship for classical proficiency. In competing for honours at the successive examinations of the University of London, on every occasion but one (and then his name was specially mentioned with honour in conjunction with that of a friend*) he reached the highest place, and in no instance without sharp competition. On taking his Master's degree in the department of Moral and Political Philosophy, he obtained the

Gold Medal, one of the highest distinctions which the University of London has to bestow. His last academic honour was on graduating Bachelor of Laws, when he divided the University Law scholarship with a competitor. In the interval between his Bachelor's and his Master's degree, he passed a year and a half at the Universities of Bonn and Berlin, where his time was pretty equally divided—in reference partly to his future profession, and partly to his ensuing degree—between the studies of philosophy and the civil law, under the eminent Professors, Brandis, Trendelenburg and Keller. Several months, previous to graduating M.A., he spent in private study at home, profiting at the same time by the instructions—which he always spoke of with profound gratitude and admiration—of his friend, the Rev. James Martineau, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in Manchester New College. Having terminated his academic career, he commenced the proper studies of his profession with uncommon assiduity, and a high relish for the particular kind of investigations and the mental exercise which they involved. Notwithstanding the depression and uncertainty which recent changes had introduced into that branch of the profession which he had adopted, his prospects from the first were full of promise. From the day of his being called to the bar, he had scarcely ever been without employment, and it was on the increase; when a disease of the heart, which, unknown to himself and to his friends, had been silently making progress for years, rapidly assumed a more formidable character, and terminated his life in little more than six months after he had entered on his profession. His mortal dust is deposited in a quiet and beautiful spot in the Highgate Cemetery. Only the nearest relatives were invited to the funeral; but an earnest request was presented to the family by several of his friends and associates, that they might be allowed to bear his earthly remains to their place of final rest; and, in spite of the weather, which kept away some who would else have been present, many who had known and loved him, and amongst the rest a dear and venerable friend, assembled at the cemetery, and offered this touching and spontaneous tribute of affection at his early grave. Dark and mysterious as this visitation seems, and though it has blighted at once the fondest hopes of relatives and friends, there is still a sad

* The Rev. Charles Beard, B.A., of Hyde, Cheshire. They were competitors for honours at the matriculation examination, 1845; Mr. Beard ranking second, Mr. Tayler third.

consolation in the thought, that it has in all probability mercifully anticipated years of mental anguish and bodily suffering. Nothing, it is thought, could finally have arrested the progress of disease; and although it is possible that over-exertion on a pedestrian tour with a friend in Switzerland during the autumn (which, had he been aware of his actual condition, it would have been wrong for him to have undertaken) may have accelerated its steps, yet the inevitable result could not have been deferred more than a year or two, and might have occurred under circumstances far more painful and afflicting. As it was, he was serene and cheerful to the end; spared much bodily suffering, except occasionally, during the last two or three days, from sense of faintness and a difficulty of breathing; his mental faculties clear and bright; his enjoyment of the society of friends uninterrupted; his affections more than ordinarily gentle and sweet; his whole bearing an example of manly patience and fortitude under the mortifying suspension of cherished pursuits and the painful frustration of eager aims: and so he passed quietly away in the bosom of his home, surrounded to the very moment of final separation by those motherly and sisterly ministrations of love, which infuse a heavenly blessing into sickness, and make death itself beautiful.

The success which had attended him in his studies, and crowned with honour his academic career, was owing in great measure to the natural clearness of his understanding, the quickness and vividness of his perceptions, his power, remarkable from childhood, of concentrated and continuous attention, and perhaps still more to his strong sense of duty and his conscientious endeavour after thoroughness in whatever he undertook. His copious notes and careful abstracts found in such abundance among his papers since his decease, attest the thought and diligence with which he read, and shew how he aimed at the complete mastery of every subject to which his attention was once seriously directed. Without being at all devoid of the power of generalization or slow to the perception of analogies, his talent consisted more particularly in the faculty of accurate discrimination and correct analysis, in quickness to discuss and dissipate false semblances, and in the sagacious apprehension of facts as they actually were. With little taste for the abstract and

the speculative, except as they contributed to throw light on the true relations of facts, he loved to grasp the concrete realities of history and politics, and to contemplate ethical truths embodied in the positive determinations of law and the living presentment of manners and character. To his strong predilection, manifested from early years, for the historical aspects and developments of humanity, must be ascribed perhaps his taste for heraldry and genealogy, and his keen enjoyment of all those scenes in nature and forms of art which suggested antiquarian associations. A quick perception of the humorous, and a ready expression of it in voice and look and gesture, had distinguished him from his boyhood; and though he had no pretensions to be a draughtsman, the rough sketches with a pen left behind him in the little books which he always carried about with him on his tours, discover a talent which might have been cultivated with success. There was a reserve in his manner, somewhat akin to pride, and an habitual avoidance of all strong expression of feeling, which might give a stranger the impression that he was of cold, ungenial temperament; while his love of the natural and genuine, and his abhorrence of any approach to exaggeration and false sentiment, lent at times an air of dryness and almost of hardness to his judgments on men and things, which was utterly foreign to the spirit of his character. With those whom he knew well, and to whom he did not shrink from unbosoming himself, he was true-hearted and affectionate. Whenever real aid could be afforded, he was, beyond most, full of thoughtful and disinterested kindness. With some ambition, restrained by high principle and great purity of mind, he had set his heart on succeeding in his profession, and worked at it with unremitting assiduity. Partly from anxieties on this account, and labouring, perhaps almost unconsciously, under a secret feeling of disease, his spirits during the last year and a half of his life were occasionally depressed; but these moods were transient, and when the cloud passed off, his naturally cheerful and joyous temper returned, and his humour, his vivacity, his playful wit, which never inflicted a wound on the feelings of others, were the delight of his companions, and made him a favourite in all the circles where he could feel himself at ease. In some Latin verses addressed to him by a

friend, and found among his papers since his death, he is commended for possessing, among other qualities,

“—acre ingenium—
Et satyræ venum non sine corde bono.”

But he possessed graver and more earnest qualities than these. His hatred of show concealed from the view of parents, and even from the more searching glance of a sister's love, how much there was of genuine purity and tenderness, and even of poetical and religious feeling, in the hidden depths of his nature; or permitted them to suspect it only at rare and distant intervals, when he was particularly moved, in an expressive look of the eye or a more than usual softness in the tones of the voice. There was, in truth, a remarkable union of manliness and sensibility in his character. Most affecting assurances have been received from several of his associates since his decease, of the silent influence for good which he had exercised over their minds. A life so pure, and so faithful to duty, could not have been made what it was, without deep and strong convictions on subjects respecting which he usually preserved silence, or broke it only to protest against intolerance and inconsistency. It was an indication of the innate goodness of his disposition, that young children always took to him, and even domestic animals from his early years would run up to him with a sort of instinctive confidence. He had great delight in female society; and from a certain mixture of pride and reserve in his composition, he used to confess that he felt more at ease and had more pleasure in conversing with amiable and educated women, than with men of his own age and standing, except where from long intercourse they had become intimate friends.

Such are the impressions which his blameless and honourable life has left on the memory of parental regret; and to have thus simply recorded them, may not prove uninteresting or worthless to the many friends who loved and respected him. But such delineation may be tinged unconsciously with a partial colouring, through that strong affection which had centred its earthly hopes and its worldly pride in the prolonged existence of a beloved child, and is stirred into intensity by the bitterness of recent bereavement. To testimony from another source more credit will naturally attach. A dear College

friend, and a member of the same honourable profession, with whom he had constantly worked together in furtherance of common objects, thus writes concerning the departed: “His deep, thoughtful, earnest and manly character, his sound judgment, his wise and temperate views, his utter hatred of everything superficial or disingenuous, no less than his rare cheerfulness and kindness of disposition and warmth of heart, made his friendship a privilege which it is impossible to overestimate. I can only hope, that as I am gratefully conscious of the great effect my friendship with him has had upon the formation of my mind and of my views, the recollections to which I shall cling of our happy and cherished intercourse, may still be a source of strength and comfort to me as long as I live.”

That a life of such promise should be thus prematurely cut short, seems strange to our limited survey of things, and taxes faith to the utmost. And yet—besides the grand trust, that all is wisely and benevolently ordered in the counsels of Providence, however inscrutable by us—there still remains the tranquillizing reflection, that while we know the realities of the Past, the possibilities of the Future must be forever unknown. Nothing can rob us of the delightful memories of an innocent and happy life, spent in the pursuit of mental and moral culture, and sweetened by the continual exercise of kind and generous affections. Who but the omniscient God can discern, what it may have been spared in the years that were to come; how the heart's peace might have been marred by the trials of life; how fearfully principle might have been assailed, and the soul's whiteness exposed to deadly stain, by the snares of the world and the seductions of ambition? Life's conflict with evil, though short, has now been honourably closed; and the character which it had disciplined, has passed, amidst the tears and regrets of attached relatives and friends, with all its pure and noble impulses still fresh and warm within, as yet unsullied by vice and uncorrupted by selfishness, into that invisible state, where it is the Christian's privilege to believe, that the spirits of the virtuous will resume and prolong, under happier influences, the career of improvement begun and interrupted on earth.

J. J. T.